THE HISTORY OF *AI* AND *EI* IN FRENCH BEFORE THE DENTAL, LABIAL, AND PALATAL NASALS.

In the following pages the history of the pronunciation in French of accented *ai* and *ei* before *n*, *m* and *ń* is to be investigated in detail. The subject naturally falls into two divisions. On the one hand we have *ai* and *ei* before *n* or *m*, and on the other we have the words in which these diphthongs are followed by *ń*. Both divisions are closely allied and the development of the one is often identical with that of the other. Yet for the better control of the material it will be advisable to separate the history of *ain* or *aim* and *ein* or *eim* from that of *aign* and *eign*.

The various grammars differ in the outline of the history of the sounds in question. Concentrating our attention first upon *ai* and *ei* followed by the dental nasal, and granting that the most direct road from the oldest stage *ãin* to modern *ẹ̃* is through *ẽin*, what would seem to be the simplest explanation may be found in Nyrop's *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, I, §§ 217 and 222. According to him, *ain* in the 11th century was pronounced *ãin*, and *ein* was *ẽin*. In the 12th century the two sounds coincide with the value of *ãin*, and remain so until about the 16th century, when the modern pronunciation *ẹ̃* develops. When both syllables had the same value, one could be written for the other, and hence the well known Old French confusion in the orthography. This view of the question is shared by Meyer-Lübke, *Grammatik der ... nischen Sprachen*, I, § 89.

There is, however, evidence ... the history of these syllables was not so simple. M... nd manuscripts present an orthography quite inc... with the value

of *ẽin* for graphic *ain*, and rimes can be cited which show
that *ãin* remained stationary while *ẽin* became *ãin*. In
consequence Behrens in the Schwan-Behrens *Altfranzösische
Grammatik*, §§ 257 and 258, admits the history outlined by
Nyrop only for the literary language, while dialectically and
in a region which he describes as lacking accurate delinea-
tion he accepts *ãin* as the common value of both *ain* and *ein*.

This pronunciation of *ãin*, which Behrens believes was dia-
lectic, is looked upon by Suchier, *Altfranzösische Grammatik*,
§ 45, as the regular sound of these syllables in the literary
language; '*ẽi* ist zu *ãi* geworden etwa in der Mitte des XII
Jahrhunderts. Seit dem werden *ein* und *ain* promiscue
geschrieben, und es ist ganz gleichgiltig, ob ein Schreiber
jenes oder dieses bevorzugt.'

It is evident that the question is sufficiently encumbered
to merit a detailed investigation. The arguments available
must be sought in rimes and to a less degree in the orthog-
raphy. For this purpose a long and representative list of
texts [1] has been studied, extending in chronological order

---

[1] I add here a rough chronological list of the texts that have been most
directly utilized for the present study and I include one or two titles that
are not cited in the discussion, so that others interested in the same prob-
lem may be spared the trouble of searching through the same texts again.
If the arguments presented here should not be found convincing, new evi-
dence will have to be sought in different sources.

Karls des Grossen Reise nach Jerusalem und Constantinopel, hrsg. von Kosch-
    witz, Heilbronn, 1883 (*Altfrz. Bibl.*, II) (*Voy. Charl.*).

Li Cumpoz Philipe de Thaün, hrsg. von E. Mall, Strassburg, 1873.

Le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaün, Texte critique par E. Walberg, Lund,
    1900.

Les Voyages Merveilleux de Saint Brandan, Légende . . . . publiée par Fr.
    Michel, Paris, 1878, and by Suchier, *Rom. Stud.*, I, pp. 567–587.
    (*Brandan.*)

Le Couronnement de Louis, publ.   E. Langlois, Paris, 1888. (*Soc. d.
    Anc. Textes.*)

Le Roman de Thèbes   L. Constans, Paris, 1890. (*Soc. d. Anc.
    Textes.*)

from the beginning to the 16th century and arranged in
groups according to the dialects. I now present this

Le Roman de Tristan par Béroul, publié par E. Muret, Paris, 1903. (*Soc.
d. Anc. Textes.*)

Eneas, publié par J. S. de Grave, Halle, 1891. (*Bibl. Norm.*, IV.)

Maistre Wace's Roman de Rou et des Ducs de Normandie, hrsg. von H.
Andresen, Heilbronn, 1877–1879. (*R. Rou.*)

Benoît de Sainte-More et le Roman de Troie par A. Joly, Paris, 1871. (*R.
Troie.*)

Le Roman de Troie par Benoît de Sainte-Maure, publié par L. Constans, vol.
I, Paris, 1904. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Chronique des Ducs de Normandie par Benoît, publiée par Fr. Michel, Paris,
1836–1844. (*Coll. d. Doc. Inéd. s. l' Hist. d. France.*)

Adgar's Marienlegenden, hrsg. von C. Neuhaus, Heilbronn, 1886. (*Altfrz.
Bibl.*, IX.)

Aiol et Mirabel und Elie de Saint Gille; Zwei altfranzösische Heldenge-
dichte, hrsg. von W. Förster, Heilbronn, 1876–1882.

Amis et Amiles und Jourdains de Blaivies; Zwei altfranzösische Heldenge-
dichte, hrsg. von C. Hofmann, Erlangen, 1852.

Aucassin und Nicolete, hrsg. von H. Suchier, Paderborn, 1899.

De Saint Laurent, poème anglonormand du XIIe siècle, publié par W.
Söderhjelm, Paris, 1888.

Sainte Catherine—Dvě Verse starofrancouzské Legendy o Sv. Katěrině
vydal U. Jarník, Prague, 1894.

La Vie de Saint Gilles par Guillaume de Berneville, publiée par G. Paris et
A. Bos, Paris, 1881. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Ille et Galeron von Walter von Arras, hrsg. von W. Förster, Halle, 1891.
(*Rom. Bibl.*, VII.)

Christian von Troyes, Sämtliche Werke, hrsg. von W. Förster, Halle, 1884–
1899.

Le Roman de Tristan par Thomas, publié par J. Bédier, Paris, 1901. (*Soc.
d. Anc. Textes.*)

Les Chansons de Gace Brulé, publiées par G. Huet, Paris, 1902. (*Soc. d.
Anc. Textes.*)

Die Lais der Marie de France, hrsg. von K. Warnke, Halle, 1900. (*Bibl.
Norm.*, III.)

Die Fabeln der Marie de France, hrsg. von K. Warnke, Halle, 1898. (*Bibl.
Norm.*, VI.)

Der Roman du Mont Saint-Michel von Guillaume de S. Paier, hrsg. von P.
Redlich, Marburg, 1894. (*Ausg. u. Abh.*, XCII.)

Estienne von Fougiere's Livre des Manières, hrsg. von J. Kremer, Marburg,
1887. (*Ausg. u. Abh.*, XXXIX.)

material, which, though not exhaustive, is yet sufficiently complete to warrant the drawing of definite conclusions; and I hope that it may serve to throw light upon one of the

La Vie de Saint Thomas le Martyr par Garnier de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, publiée par C. Hippeau, Paris, 1889.

The Metrical Chronicle of Jordan Fantosme, edited by R. Howlett, London, 1886.

Hue de Rotelande's Ipomedon, hrsg. von E. Kölbing und E. Koschwitz, Breslau, 1889.

Estoire de la Guerre Sainte par Ambroise, publiée par G. Paris, Paris, 1897. (*Coll. d. Doc. Inéd. s. l' Hist. d. France.*)

L' Escoufle, publié par H. Michelant et P. Meyer, Paris, 1894. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Robert le Diable, publié par E. Löseth, Paris, 1903. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Le Roman de la Rose ou de Guillaume de Dole, publié par G. Servois, Paris, 1893. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Chardry's Josaphaz, Set Dormanz und Petit Plet, hrsg. von J. Koch, Heilbronn, 1879. (*Altfrz. Bibl.*, I.)

The Song of Dermot and the Earl, published by G. H. Orpen, Oxford, 1892.

Li Romans de Carité et de Miserere du Renclus de Moiliens, publié par A.-G. van Hamel, Paris, 1885. (*Bibl. d. l' Éc. d. Hautes Études.*)

Maistre Elie's Ueberarbeitung der ältesten französischen Uebertragung von Ovid's Ars Amatoria, hrsg. von Kuhne und Stengel, Marburg, 1886. (*Ausg. u. Abh.*, XLVII.)

La Clef d'Amors, hrsg. von A. Doutrepont, Halle, 1890. (*Bibl. Norm.*, V.)

Li Chevaliers as deus Espees, hrsg. von W. Förster, Halle, 1877.

Li Romans de Durmart le Galois, hrsg. von E. Stengel für den litterarischen Verein in Stuttgart, 1873.

Le Roman de Renart, hrsg. von E. Martin, Strassburg, 1881–1887.

Guillaume de Palerne, publié par H. Michelant, Paris, 1876. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Le Bestiaire . . . . des Guillaume le Clerc, hrsg. von R. Reinsch, Leipzig, 1892. (*Altfrz. Bibl.*, XIV.)

Le Besant de Dieu von Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie, hrsg. von E. Martin, Halle, 1869.

Raoul de Houdenc, Le Songe d'Enfer, Le Songe de Paradis, Li Romans des Eles, publiés par A. Scheler, *Trouvères Belges*, Louvain, 1879, vol. II.

La Vie de Saint Grégoire par Frère Angier, publiée par P. Meyer, *Romania*, XII, pp. 145–208.

Trois Versions rimées de l'Évangile de Nicodème, publiées par G. Paris et A. Bos, Paris, 1885. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

very vexing problems of French Historical Grammar. We shall consider in the first place the history of *ai* and *ei* before *n* or *m*.

L' Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal, publiée par P. Meyer, 3 vols., Paris, 1891–1901. (*Soc. d. l' Hist. de France*), vol. I.

La Bible Guiot de Provins in *Fabliaux et Contes des Poètes Français*, publiés par Barbazon et Méon, Paris, 1808, vol. II, pp. 307–393.

Le Dit des Rues de Paris, *ibid.*, pp. 238–275.

Les Cricries de Paris, *ibid.*, pp. 276–286.

Les Moustiers de Paris, *ibid.*, pp. 287–292.

Le Roman de Galerent, publié par A. Boucherie, Paris, 1888. (*Soc. pour l' étude des lang. rom.*)

Wistasse le Moine, hrsg. von W. Förster und J. Trost, Halle, 1891. (*Rom. Bibl.*, IV.)

Lyoner Yzopet, hrsg. von W. Förster, Heilbronn, 1882. (*Altfrz. Bibl.*, v.)

Le Roman de la Rose, publié par Fr. Michel, Paris, 1872.

Floris et Liriope des Robert de Blois, hrsg. von W. von Zingerle, Leipzig, 1891. (*Altfrz. Bibl.*, XII.)

Jean Bodel, Le Jeu de Saint Nicolas.

Adam de la Halle, Le Jeu de la Feuillie, both published by Monmerqué et Michel, *Théâtre Français au moyen âge*, Paris, 1885.

Adam de la Halle, Le Jeu de Robin et Marion in Bartsch-Horning, *La Langue et la Littérature Française*, Paris, 1887, col. 523–548.

Trouvères Belges, publiés par A. Scheler, Louvain, 1866–1879.

Rutebeuf, Œuvres Complètes, publiées par A. Jubinal, Paris, 1874–1875. (*Bibl. Elzévirienne.*)

Richars li Biaus, hrsg. von W. Förster, Wien, 1874.

Les Œuvres poétiques de Philippe de Remi, sire de Beaumanoir, publiées par H. Suchier, Paris, 1884–1885. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*) *La Manekine*, vol. I.

Li Dis dou Vrai Aniel, hrsg. von A. Tobler, Leipzig, 1884.

Octavian, hrsg. von K. Vollmöller, Heilbronn, 1883. (*Altfrz. Bibl.*, III.)

Œuvres Complètes d' Eustache Deschamps, publiées par Queux de Saint-Hilaire et G. Raynaud, Paris, 1878–1903. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes*), vol. I and II.

Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages, publiés par G. Paris et U. Robert, Paris, 1876–1883. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes*), vols. I, II and III.

Œuvres poétiques de Christine de Pisan, publiées par M. Roy, Paris, 1886–1896. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Meliador par Froissart, publié par A. Longnon, Paris, 1895–1899. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Poésies Complètes de Charles d' Orléans, publiées par Ch. d' Héricault, Paris, 1896.

I.

AIN—EIN.

The two syllables *ain* and *ein* are not found forming assonance or riming together in the *Alexis*, the *Roland*, the *Reimpredigt*, the French translation of Marbod's *Lapidary*, the *Comput* and *Bestiaire* of Philippe de Thaon. They are kept distinct even as late as Guillaume de Berneville's *Vie de Saint Gilles*.[1] In these texts the pronunciation was *ãin* and *ẽin* respectively; cp. *mains, Rol.* 3965, in assonance with -*an*, *ceinte, ibid.* 984, in *ei* assonance, and *peine* 1787, *aleine* 1789, *feindre* 1792 in assonance with *sanglente, temples, entendent*, etc.; cp. also Engelmann, *Ueber die Entstehung der Nasalvokale*, Halle, 1882, pp. 20 ff.

The earliest[2] definite evidence of a confusion of the two syllables in rime occurs in the *Brandan*.[3] Here *ain* and *ein*

Œuvres Poétiques de Guillaume Alexis, prieur de Bucy, publiées par A. Piaget et E. Picot, Paris, 1896–1899. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

L'Amant rendu Cordelier, poème attribué à Martial d'Auvergne, publié par A. de Montaiglon, Paris, 1881. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*)

Le Mistère du Viel Testament, publié par le baron James de Rothschild, Paris, 1878–1891. (*Soc. d. Anc. Textes.*) Vol. I.

Die Werke Maistre François Villons, hrsg. von W. von Wurzbach, *Romanische Forschungen*, XVI, pp. 405–584.

Œuvres Complètes de Clément Marot, publiées par B. Saint-Marc, Paris, Garnier, without date.

[1] Cp. G. Paris, *ed.* p. xxvii.

[2] In his *Altfrz. Gram.*, p. 72, Suchier cites as earliest instance of the mingling of *ain* and *ein, desteint : refraint, Bestiaire* 2865. However, this rime would be so unique for Philippe de Thaon, that Walberg in his edition of the text, pp. xlviii and 146, rejects the reading and adopts *restreinte : desteinte* instead.

[3] To this categorical statement the following note must be added. The *Voyage de Charlemagne* in its assonances shows the same pronunciation of the syllables in question as the *Roland*, cp. Koschwitz, *Rom. Stud.*, II, pp. 38 ff. At the same time this poem contains one *laisse*, ll. 783–802, which

rime freely; cp. *quarenteine* : *semaine* 133, *cha*[*e*]*ines* :
semaines 866, *funtaines* : *pleines* 998, 1586, *meindres* :
greindres 1004, and from this poem on, mixture of the
two is constant in Old French texts. Suchier suggests,
Altfrz. Gram., p. 72, that the process was somewhat slower
on the continent than it was in England. Wace in the
Roman de Rou has 48 pure *ain* and 14 pure *ein* rimes, and
only one instance of fusion, *Saint Oain* : *secrestain* (ANDŒNUM :
-ANUM), l. 347. However Pohl, *Rom. Forsch.*, II, pp. 581–2,
has shown that while this observation is undoubtedly exact,
it is very probably true that the inference that Wace con-
sciously separates the two syllables is not justified, for in
the same author's *Brut* mixture of the two is much more
frequent, and, at any rate, in other continental texts of the
same period, such as *Eneas*, the poems of Marie de France,
and Benoît de Sainte-More, the *Livre des Manières*, fusion
of the two syllables is quite the rule. In view of these
facts it is not at all surprising that in the prose texts of this

appears to contradict the accuracy of this assertion. Here the following
sequence of assonances is found : *Charlemaignes* : *compaignes* : *deplaindre* :
France : *regne* : *grande* : *enfraindre* : *remaignet* : *Charlemaigne* : *plaines* : *pleines* :
descende : *ente* : *aimet* : *regne* : *France* : *Charlemaignes* : *plaigne*. It will be
impossible to avoid the conclusion that for this poem *en* and *an* form a
correct assonance (cp. *Rom. Stud.*, II, p. 49), though the mixture of the
two is not very frequent. That *regne* should be found in the same laisse
need not surprise. It had become *răñe* in pronunciation, and there are
numerous other texts giving evidence of a similar pronunciation of the
word. However, difficulty is created by the appearance of *pleines*, l. 793,
in the series. Since the separation of *ain* and *ein* seems so clearly demanded
by the assonances of this text, Koschwitz, *l. c.*, p. 40, suggests that the
lines 783–802 should be divided into three laisses as follows : (1) 783–792,
ái : *a*, (2) 793–795, *éi* : *e*, (3) 796–802, *ái* : *a*. Considering the probable
age of the poem and its dialect, this explanation is presumably correct, but
whatever the final decision may be, the consideration of the present problem
need not concern itself with these lines. Everything depends upon the
age of the poem, and if it should be younger than the *Roland*, these
assonances would only corroborate what we can observe elsewhere.

period *ain* and *ein* are constantly confused in orthography ; cp. for the *Montébourg Psalter*, Harseim, *Rom. Stud.*, IV, pp. 277 and 283 ; for the *Cambridge Psalter*, Schumann, *Vokalismus und Konsonantismus des Cambridger Psalters*, *Franz. Stud.*, IV, fasc. 4, pp. 17 and 29, and for the *Quatre Livres des Rois*, Schlösser, *Die Lautverhältnisse der Quatre Livres des Rois*, Leipzig, 1887, pp. 13 and 31.

The next point to be discussed is the pronunciation of this syllable written indifferently *ain* or *ein*. To facilitate the control of the available material, we shall divide the examples according to the letter or letters which may follow after the nasal consonant.

1). *ain — ein.*

The union of these two syllables in rime leaves no question that their pronunciation was identical, but it gives no clue as to the nature of the vowel or diphthong that was pronounced. Inasmuch as this was either *ãin* or *ẽin* we may look for imperfect rimes with *an* or *en* as capable of throwing light on the problem. A few examples of *ain* : *an* occur in the texts which I have examined, and we may add those of *ains* : *ans* as having the same value. Cp. *Brandan* : *pan* (PANNUM), *Brandan* 480, *Brandan* : *an*, *ibid.* 824, *Brandan* : *vilain*, *ibid.* 163, *Brandan* : *main*, *ibid.* ˙658, *Brandans* : *mains*, *ibid.* 203, *pan* (PANEM) : *ahan*, *Mist. Adam* 434, but *pain* : *Evain*, *ibid.* 786, *Trajan* : *roman*, Angier, *Grégoire* 2539, but *Traien* : *paien*, *ibid.* 2715, *derrans* : *Johans*, Angier, *Dialogues*, 72, r°b, cited by Miss Pope, *Langue de Frère Angier*, Paris, 1903, p. 12, *esturman* : *certan*, *Eneas* 205. For the correct appreciation of these rimes it should be noted that of the words in question, *vilain, main, pan, roman, derrans* and *certan*, involve the Latin vowel *a*, and that *Brandan* is a proper name in which the tonic syllable may have retained its Latin value.[1] When

---

[1] Cp. Suchier, *Zs. f. rom. Phil*, IX, p. 89, note.

we take into account, furthermore, the fact that the texts
from which these few rimes are taken cover a period of a
hundred years, and that *ains*, which certainly had the same
value of vowel as *ain*, occurs in the same texts and in others
of the same period and dialect in rime with *ens* and *iens*
(cp. below, p. 646), it becomes evident that these examples
represent rime licences.   They are either pure Latinisms[1] or
remnants of the earlier practice exemplified by the asso-
nances cited above from the *Roland*, but they have no
argumentative value for the determination of the pronuncia-
tion of *ain* in this dialect and during this period.

Rimes of *ain* or *ein* with *ęn* on the other hand are even
rarer.   It must be borne in mind that $\tilde{ę}n$ in the final sylla-
ble of the word exists in Old French only in a few learned
names and in words of the categories of BENE and PAGANUM.
Of the former, as far as I know, only a single instance
occurs in the texts examined, *Jerusalem* : *Alein*, B. *Chron.*
36894.   When compared with *Alain* : *main*, *ibid.* 36940,
main : *frein* 16366 and *Jerusalem* : *huem* 31752, it becomes
evident that both *ain* and *ein* in this text cannot have been
ãin and this is also the conclusion of Pohl, *Rom. Forsch.*, II,
p. 554.

Mixture with *ien* points in the same direction.   The
actual rimes that can be cited here are not very numerous,
because the inflected forms of the syllables in question are
more frequent in rime than the uninflected.   Their discussion
may, therefore, be deferred to the succeeding paragraph.

2). *ains* — *eins*, *ainz* — *einz*.

Several rimes show mixture with *ens* or *enz*; cp. *defens* :
mains (MINUS), *Mist. Adam* 148, *meins* : *tens*, *Gaimar* 1811,
ateinz : *defenz*, B. *Chron.* 22848, *genz* : *seinz*, *ibid.* 32235.
Since checked *e* before a nasal in these texts was certainly $\tilde{ę}$

[1] Cp. Miss Pope, *l. c.*, p. 12.

it will be difficult to avoid the conclusion that *ains* and *eins*
tended in the same direction.   This inference is emphasized
by the existence in the same and similar texts of a certain
number of rimes just referred to, beginning with the *R.*
Troie, which show fusion of *ains* and *eins* with *iens.*   In the
Eneas we can observe only mixture of *iens* and *ens*; cp.
Troïens : tens (TEMPUS) 565, 601, 5811, 6319, *anciëns : tens*
4127, *Sabiëns : cuens* 3949, *cuens : Volcens* 5093, and the
same is true of Marie de France; cp. *anciëns : tens, Milun*
63.   The *R. Rou* contains no examples in point, but the
R. Troie and *B. Chron.* continue the tradition of the *Eneas,*
while they add besides rimes of *ain(s)* and *ein(s)* with *ien(s).*
Since the latter was *iẹ̃n(s),* as shown through the union with
ens = *ẹ̃ns,* there can be little question about the pronuncia-
tion of the former.   The following are the examples :—

  ien(s) : en(s)—R. Troie.[1] *Troïen : sen* 5813, 6815, *nequeden :*
Troïen 18641, *Troïens : tens* 581, 7179, 20471, *: porpens*
19915, *Atheniens : tens* 8489, *Sisiliens : buens* 18581, *Paflago-*
niens : suens 20515; *B. Chron. suen : bien,* I–1765 (cp. *suens :*
buens, II–3005), *boens : cristiens,* II–24307, *tens : Egiptiens,*
I–413, *paiens : sens,* II–23081, *tens : crestiens,* II–39017.

  ien(s) : ein(s)—R. Troie. meins *: Troiains* 5275; *B. Chron.*
bien : Saint Oien, II–19550 (cp. *Sainz Oieins : mains* (MANUS),
II–25840, *main* (MANE) *: Oain,* II–7009, 19354).

  ien(s) : ain(s)—R. Troie. primerains : Troiains 13903, 18745,
25273, *germains : Indiains* 14091, *Frisains : primerains* 15549;
B. Chron. cristiens : premerains, I–925, *: parreins,* II–6577,
7988, *bien : Saint Oien* 19550 (cp. *Saint Oain : main,* II–
19354).

  Of the same general nature are the rimes *Swein : buen*
B. Chron. 31046, *Sueins : buens* 38889 and *seins* (= *suens*)

: *Aleins* 31008 (cp. *Alains* : *seins* (SANUS), *R. Rou* 2735),
interesting particularly for the orthography, for *Suein* is
the usual bisyllabic *Soen, Suen*,[1] and *seins* stands for *suens*.
The *Chron. Mt. S. Mich.* presents only a single rime *ancieins* :
pens (PENSO) 3752, interesting also for the orthography,
while the *Livre d. Man.* has no rime in point.   But the
Beroul Tristan contains *Brengain* : *bien* 523, : *mien* 553,
Lan[ci]ën : *Ivein* 1155, *Uriën* : *Dinoalain* 3487, *suen* : *Denoa-
len* 4435.   Here *Brengain* may stand for *Brangien* and can,
therefore, not enter into the argument, except in as much as
it shows the value ascribed to the combination *ain* by the
copyist.   *Frans* : *mains B. Trist.* 3327 is discussed by Muret,
edition, p. xliv.   On the basis of Gottfried of Strassburg's
rime *Isôt als blansche mains* : *Kâedin li frains,* which he
probably derived from Thomas, and Heinrich of Freiberg's
appellative *li frenîs* of the same knight he concludes ' nous
devons peut-être rétablir au vers 3327 une épithète tradi-
tionelle, distincte de l'adjectif franc.'   Finally, though the
text does not belong strictly to the same dialect, and yet
pointing in the same direction as far as the pronunciation
of the syllables in question is concerned, there should be
cited from the *R. Thèbes* the rimes *ren* : *germain* 6807, and
demen (demain) : *ben* 8249, 8271, *ben* : *ven* (VANUM) 8487.
Here also *ien* rimes with *uen*, as in *rens* : *suens* 4343.   The
same rime of *ain* : *ien* is probably also involved in the follow-
ing series from the *Vie de Saint Thomas* of Garnier de Pont-
Sainte-Maxence where *prochain* rimes with *main* : *plain* :
sain : *soverain* on p. 53 and in the form *prosceins* with *biens* :
miens : *riens* : *fiens* on p. 130.

It seems to me that it will be difficult to avoid what
appears to be the evident inference demanded by these

9

rimes. The fusion of *ien(s)* with *en(s)* on the one hand and
with *ain(s)* and *ein(s)* on the other, together with the rimes
of *ains* or *eins* with *ens* or *enz* in texts where *ens* was pro-
nounced *ẹ̃ns*, allows only of one conclusion, viz., that *ain(s)*
and *ein(s)* in the dialect represented by these texts tended
in the direction of their modern value, and had certainly
arrived at least at the stage *ẽin(s)*. That *iens* should then
in the pen of a copyist speaking the same dialect become
iains or *ieins* need cause no astonishment. This ortho-
graphy merely represents his effort to make the rime accept-
able to the eye. How far geographically this orthographic
habit extended I am unable to say. Stock, *Rom. Stud.*, II,
p. 468, cites a similar example (*chrestiains : sains*) from
the *Rom. de Mahomet*, l. 1091. Angier writes *premerain* :
Maximiain, Grégoire 257, and Miss Pope, *l. c.*, p. 14, adds
arrien : sen, arriens : tens but *arrieins : veins* from the *Dia-
logues* of the same author. There are, no doubt, other
instances of this orthography that might be collected, as
for example *primeraine : meiaine* (*moyenne*) in the *Bestiaire
de Gervaise*,[1] l. 503, but it is evident that the harvest
outside of the manuscripts of *R. Troie* and *B. Chron.* is
limited.

Occasionally a Latinism of the type cited above, p. 644,
may be found ; cp. *ancian : an, Gaimar* 1682, but *ancien :
mien, ibid.* 4319, *Octavian : pan, Marie de France, Lanval*
85, *Troïan : oan, Eneas* 1699, 2109, *Troians : chans, R. Troie*
2299. Suchier, *Altfrz. Gram.*, p. 75, adds some similar
orthographies from the *R. Rou* and the *Ps. Cott.*, but all
such examples are rare and do not affect our problem.

3). *aint — eint, ainte — einte.*

As in the preceding rime-groups the Anglo-Norman and
Norman texts under consideration present little beyond

---

[1] Cp. *Romania*, I, pp. 426–442.

simple mixture of the two syllables. However, as before, a few isolated rimes show the direction in which the development tended. Suchier, *l. c.*, p. 73, cites *niënt : veint* and *niënt : desteint* from *Sanson de Nantuil*. We may add, from *B. Chron.*, *ateint : destruiement* 17391, *teint* (TENET) : *aimt* 20779, *feint* (FINGIT) : *vient* 21670, *seinte : reinte* (REDEMPTA), *Angier*, *Gregoire* 1467 and *ceynt* (CINCTUM) : *torment*, *Évang. de Nicodème*, version C, 767.

4). *aindre — eindre*.

Our texts here show only fusion of the two, but never rime with *ēndre* in such words as *prendre*. Since verbs with this ending are comparatively frequent, it is rather remarkable that this should be the case. Only *mendre — meindre* < MINOR might seem to contradict this rule. However this contradiction does not exist in reality, for *mendre* appears to be the original form of the word and the diphthong in *meindre* is due to the analogy of *meins* < MINUS. As a matter of fact *mendre* is found frequently at the end of the line, but, as far as my observation goes, it rimes only with words like *entendre*, *B. Chron.* 403, 22516, *descendre* 6243, *prendre* 10159 and never with *remaindre*, *feindre* and the like. This is true of all the Norman texts in this study, the *Clef d'Amour* included.[1]

An instance of what indeed might seem to be mixture of *eindre* with *endre* exists in strophes 54 and 111 of the *Livre des Manières*; cp. *raindre* (r. *raeindre*) : *pleindre* : *remeindre* : *ateindre*, str. 54, and *defendre* : *vendre* : *prendre* : *raïendre*,

---

[1] I have noted but one exception to this rule, *meindres : greindres*, *Brand.* 1004, which invites construction into an argument for the pronunciation of *greindres* of the type of *eint : ent* just noted. However the matter is too doubtful to be pressed; we probably have to do simply with an early sporadic case of the analogy so common later. The old form persisted for a long time. Christine de Pisan rimes *chambre : tendre : remembre : mendre*, *Livre du Dit de Poissy* 280, though elsewhere she joins *meindre : remaindre*, *Livre du Duc des Vrais Amants*, 1155.

str. 111. Both *raindre* and *raiendre* represent the same
Latin verb REDIMERE > *raembre*, which on account of its
unique form was drawn over to the *-ndre* verbs, like *tre-
mere* > *craindre*. But while the stemvowel in both forms,
raeindre and *raiendre* is entirely analogical, it is probably
wrong to consider the two as equivalent. The former, pro-
nounced *raēindre*, could rime with *plēindre*, the latter was
raiēndre, if not *raēndre*, which forms rime with *prēndre*.

Another rime pair with similar bearing stands in Guil-
laume le Maréchal, l. 2883, *remendre* (= *remaindre*) : *at-
tendre*. Unfortunately this rime loses its argumentative
value from the fact that the last six letters of the second
word represent a manuscript correction not written by the
original scribe in the place of something else that has been
erased.

5). *einge*.

As early as the *Brandan* this syllable could rime with
enge as in *prenge*. It is not of frequent occurrence, being
found only in those peculiar Anglo-Norman present sub-
junctives in *-ge* as *meinge* : *prenge*, *Brandan* 119. Since
the second word here certainly contained the nasal $\tilde{\varrho}$, cp.
calengent : *prengent*, *ibid.* 1472, *meinge* must have had at
least the value of *mēinge*.

6). *aine* — *eine*.

The rimes for the most part show only the usual mixture
of the two syllables. Instances proving the development
of the pronunciation in the direction of $\tilde{\varrho}ne$ are rather late.
As a matter of fact the combination of $\varrho + nasal + \varrho$ is rare
in Old French. Its main representatives are the French
forms of FEMINA and REGNUM. Rimes between these two
words are well known in Old French texts. Without in any
way aiming to be exhaustive I may cite *Comput* 469, *Eneas*
3, Wace *Brut*, though not the *R. Rou*, cp. Pohl, *Rom. Forsch.*,
II, p. 554, *R. Troie* 3937, *B. Chron.* 1621, *B. Trist.* 287 as

texts where *an* and *en* are not mixed in rime, from which it
follows that *femme* : *regne* means *fę̃me* : *rę̃ne* or *rę̃ńe*. Now
these same texts in a limited number of rime pairs show
these words joined to others in *-aine* or *-eine*; cp. *peine* :
regne, *Eneas* 2523, *estreine* (STRENA) : *regne*, *R. Troie* 8317,
Loherenne : *femme*, *B. Chron.* 18052, *regne* : *Loheregne*, *ibid.*
18066, *vilaine* : *reigne*, *B. Trist.* 57. The conclusion that in
these texts *aine* or *eine* mean at least *ę̃ine* will be difficult
to avoid.[1]

Another combination of rimes pointing in the same direc-
tion is that of *aine* or *eine* with *iene*, similar to that of *ain(s)*
or *ein(s)* with *ien(s)* already noted. As earliest instance of
this fusion might be cited *paaine* : *soltaine*, *Eneas* 2141,
though it is of course possible to regard this rime as a
Latinism. It is different, however, with *plataine* : *Egiptaine*,
R. Troie 22995, and *B. Chron.* *vilaine* : *paene*, I–951, *do-*
maine : *paene*, II–15812, (cp. *anciene* : *paene*, II–57, *paene* :
crestiene, II–3073, 4383), *mundaines* : *celestienes*, II–20898,
estrienne (STRENA) : *Bauveisienne*, II–18484, *Rentiëne* (= *de*
Reims) : *plaine*, *B. Trist.* 3727 and *maenne* (*moyenne*) :
enchaenne (= *enchaîne*), *Clef d'Amours* 3419. These words
rime only if *aine* or *eine* are pronounced *ẽine* or *ẽne*.

The *Livre des Manières* has three strophes which make
some difficulty; cp. the following rimes: *anciennes* :*paien-*
nes : *sennes* (SYNODOS) : *fames* (FEMINAS), str. 247; *fame*
(FEMINA) : *fame* (FAMA) : *raiemme* : *jame* (GEMMA), str. 60;
enteime : *deraime* : *sorseime* : *feme*, str. 312. It is seen that
in strophe 60 *fame* = FAMA seems to oppose the value of
ę̃me for *fame* =FEMINA. Kremer in his edition of the text
p. 27 cites the various explanations of this discrepancy that

[1] A single rime in Adgar's *Legends*, *mainent* : *chantent* 4–9, seems to con-
tradict this conclusion. It is so unique that I regard it as erroneous for
hantent : *chantent*.

have been offered, but they all fail to satisfy. It seems to
have been overlooked that the line containing *fame* = FAMA,
60 b, is too short by one syllable. While this fact tends to
throw doubt on the reading of the line, it does not, however,
prove that the rime is incorrect. We will have to accept
femme as riming in this text both with *e* and with *a*. The
same phenomenon is not unknown in other texts where *an*
and *en* are kept distinct. Cp. *realme : femme, Gaimar* 3601,
but *mercenne : femme* 2507, *regne : femme* 2531, *fame : dame,*
R. Troie 18154 ; see also *Rom. Stud.,* II, p. 39, and *Rom.*
Forsch., II, p. 554.

   7). *aime — eime.*

Only very few rimes of this category are available.
Since *ẽime* < EMA does not exist in Old French, *ãime* <
AMA can only rime with itself. Later, however, when *ãime*
had become *ẽime*, a few other words having *ẹme* became
available. This, I believe, is the explanation of *esment*
(ESTIMANT) : *cleiment, Angier, Grégoire* 645, *aime : baptesme,*
Simund de Freine, Vie de Saint Georges 1324 and *meime* (=
mesme) : *aime, Rom. de Philosophie* 981 of the same author.

   Suchier, *Altfrz. Gram.,* p. 71, thinks *esment* stands for
eiment and that the disappearing *s* had called forth a *j* which
formed a diphthong with the preceding vowel. Granting
that this was the case, we should even then have evidence in
these rimes that *ãime* had become *ẽime.* I doubt, however,
whether this explanation is exact. That *s* before *l* and *n*
in the course of disappearance passed through a sound
capable of palatalizing the following consonant seems fairly
reasonable, but this question can not enter into the dis-
cussion here. Examples in support are cited by Wal-
berg, *Le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaün,* p. lxv. It does
not follow, however, that the process was identical before
m. Here it is much more likely that the intervening sound

was a voiceless *m*, such as Wulff[1] has shown to exist under similar circumstances in Andalusian Spanish. When finally all trace of the *s* had disappeared, the vowel in words like *esment, baptesme* was *ę*, and *ei* and *ey* are only graphic variants utilized by the copyist to represent this sound. Then these words were pronounced *ęment, baptęme* and the rimes in question are entirely parallel to those cited above for *ēine : ęne*.

This conclusion is emphasized by the following rimes of *aime : ieme* from the *R. Thèbes* ; cp. *crement : ement* 5077, *creme : afeme* (ADFAMAT) 7377, *entrement : crement* 8603, *creme : eme* 9199.

All the evidence presented so far goes to prove that in the northwest of France and in England *ai* and *ei* with *n* had become *ēin* about the middle of the 12th century, and that under favorable circumstances the sound could even approximate *ęn*. The evidence of the orthography points in the same direction. We have to do with a region where for the most part *an* and *en* are kept distinct. A scribe who pronounced *en + cons.* as *ęn* would not have written *en* for either *ain* or *ein*, had he pronounced these *ãin*, as *Brandan enz (ainz)* 1010, *desclem* 534, *sen (saint)* 157, nor would he have introduced *ein* in *mendre* if *meindre* had meant *mãindre* for him as in the rime *tendre : meindre, Ipomedon* 2651. A survey of the orthographic habits in Anglo-Norman texts can be found in Stimming's edition of *Boeve de Haumtone,*[2] pp. 185, 196–7, and 201, and in the manuscripts of continental texts similar habits prevail. Görlich arrives at the same conclusions from the study[3] of the original documents

---

[1] *Un chapitre de phonétique andalouse*, in *Recueil de Mémoires philologiques présenté a Monsieur Gaston Paris par ses élèves suédois*, 1889, pp. 45 ff.

[2] *Bibliotheca Normannica*, vol. VII.

[3] Görlich, *Die Nordwestlichen Dialekte der Langue d' Oïl, Franz. Stud.*, v, Heft 3, pp. 17–18 and 41.

of the Northwest dialects of the second half of the 13th and
the 14th centuries. Besides the noncommittal *ein* he cites *e*
in *preschene, prochen, Alen, men, nonen, fren, plen, plene,
Magdalene, ae* in *maen, daraene, prechaens, prochaenne, aei*
in *Alaein, prochaein, ee* in *dareen, oei* in *Moeine* and *oe* in
damoene, demoene.

We may close this division of our subject with the fol-
lowing passage from the *Orthographia Gallica*[1] which em-
phasizes the conclusions at which we have arrived ; 'item
diversitas scripture facit aliquarum diccionum quamvis in
voce sint consimiles, verbi gracia . . . . teindre tendre tenir
attendre atte[i]ndre . . . . aymer amer,' which can of course
only mean *tēndre* and *teindre, attēndre* and *atteindre* are pro-
nounced alike. The rule is found only in MSS. C and O, *i. e.*,
in the later version of this earliest grammatical treatise, but
even thus it gives valuable evidence of the pronunciation of
our syllables in the 14th century, and is entirely in harmony
with what we have been able to observe so far.

II.

Leaving the Norman and Anglo-Norman division of Old
French texts we may now continue the history of our
syllables into the dialect from which the Modern French
most directly sprang.

One of the earliest texts to be cited here is the *Roman de
l' Escoufle,* written about the year 1200. In this poem *en*
and *an + cons.* are kept apart in rime, in spite of the
fact that *feme* rimes with *ame,* as l. 125, and *gemme* with
dame, as l. 5739. But as already pointed out above, p. 652,
the same phenomenon can be observed in other texts sepa-

[1] Ed. Stürzinger, *Altfrz. Bibl.,* vol. VIII (Heilbronn, 1884), p. 14.

rating *ēn* and *ãn*.[1] The nasal *ę̃n* exists in such rimes as
suens : sens 3189, *vit l'en : Julien* 4867, *enmena : cil l'en a*
3647, *amena : dame en a* 5969. In the light of these *losenge :
vos ain ge* 2877 can only be interpreted as meaning *lozę̃ǵę :
vozę̃ǵę*. The *Roman de Guillaume de Dole*, which Gaston
Paris was inclined to attribute to the same author,[2] shows
the same mixture of *feme : dame* 1508, 3008, and rimes
maint (MANET) *: esloint* 4192. This fusion of *ain : oin*, which
occurs here, as far as I know, for the first time speaks for a
pronunciation *ę̃n : oę̃n*. Another isolated early example of
the same rime, though of uncertain date, can be found in the
Rom. de Renard, branch 9, written by the priest of La
Croix-en-Brie, *moines* (MONACHUS) *: poines* (PENAS) 505.

From this date forward it is possible to cite an uninter-
rupted series of texts, including Marot, all showing the same
fusion of *ain* and *oin*, which thus present unmistakable evi-
dence that in the dialect centering in Paris both *ain* and *ein*
were steadily developing toward their modern value. I
copy this list without further comment, and as much as
possible in chronological order. The fact that these rimes
are few in number in comparison with the *ain : ein* rimes
probably means that they were felt to be irregularities or
rime licences, and this will have to be taken into account in
the final estimation of their meaning.

Gaufrey[3] — *hautaine : Karlemaine : humaine : emmaine :
regne : souveraine : demouraine : demaine : essoigne : Couloigne :
entente : jenne* (= *jeune*) *: quarantaine*, p. 316.

---

[1] For Picard and Wallonian cp. Haase, *Das Verhalten der pikardischen und
wallonischen Denkmäler des Mittelalters in Bezug auf a und e vor gedecktem n.*
Halle, 1880, pp. 41 ff.

[2] Cp. *Romania*, XXXII, pp. 487–488. He there suggests 1185 as the date
of the *Escoufle* and 1200 as that of *Guillaume de Dole*. The last edition of
his *Litt. Franç. au moyen âge* places *Guillaume de Dole* in 1200 and the *Escoufle*
in 1210.

[3] Cited by Engelmann, *l. c.*, p. 23.

Roman de la Rose — *paintes* (PINCTAS) : *cointes*, I, pp. 20, 30, 46–47, *paintes* : *pointes* (PUNCTAS) I, p. 31, *maintes* : *ointes*, I, pp. 249–250, *poine* (PENA) : *moine* (MONACHUS) I, p. 100, *saine* : *essoine*, I, p. 73.

Rutebuef — *avaine* : *vaine* : *couvaine*, I, p. 33, *poigne* (PUGNA) : *sovraine* : *moine* : *essoine*, I, p. 153, *lainne* : *avainne* : *semainne*, II, p. 57, *demaine* : *moine*, II, pp. 122, 137, *moine* : *emmaine*, II, p. 129, *Jordain* : *enjoin*, II, p. 276, *nonains* : *sains* : *certains* : *mains* (MINUS) II, p. 42, *plaindre* : *joindre* : *poindre*, I, p. 216, *saintes* : *jointes* : *empraintes* : *maintes*, II–253.

Eustache Deschamps — *moins* (MINUS) : *mains* (*MANTI) : *mains* : *vains*, I, XXV, *conjoint* : *point* : *vaint* (VINCIT) I–LXXI, *doint* (DONET) : *pourpoint* : *point* : *point* : *faint* (FINGIT) : *vaint* : (VINCIT) II–CCXL.

Christine de Pisan — *loings* : *moins* : *besoings* : *froins* (FRENUM) I, p. 26, *moins* : *besoings*, I, p. 56, *mains* : *mains* (MINUS) I, p. 123, III, p. 40.

Miracles de Nostre Dame — *moins* : *chastellains*, IV–178, *lointain* : *soing*, XI–9, *moine* (MONACHUS) : *amaine*, XVIII–1313, *estraine* : *royne*, IV–908, cp. *Guillaume Alexis* and *Villon* below.

Charles d'Orléans — *plains* (PLANGO) : *plains* (PLENUS) : *moins* : *mains*, I–192, *besoing* : *loing* : *baing* : *poing*, II–98, *avoine* : *Touraine* : *paine* : *sepmaine*, II–157.

Guillaume Alexis — *fainctes* (FINCTAS) : *coinctes*, *Déb. de l'Homme et de la Femme* 128, *traine* : *demaine* : *pourmaine* : *chanoine* : *gaine* : *maine*, *Blason des Faulses Amours*, str. 40, *primeraine* : *essoine* : *Anthoine* : *royne* : *villaine* : *loingtaine*, *ibid.* 61, *mains* : *mains* (MINUS) : *plains* : *mains* : *poins* : (PUGNUS) : *point* (PUNCTUM), *ibid.* str. 80, *chanoines* : *peines* : *demaines*, *Martyrologue des Fausses Langues* 254.

L'Amant rendu Cordelier — *mondaines* : *avoynes* : *marjo-*

laines : *certaines* 410, *saindre* (CINGERE) : *estraindre* : *joindre* :
atteindre 1706, *baings* : *aubefoings* : *poings* : *mains* 1762.

Villon — *fain* (FAMEM) : *foing* (fenum), *Poésies Diverses*
140, *bain* (MS. *boing*) : *poing, ibid.* 148, *Anthoine* : *Saine* :
essoine : *ydoyne, Pet. Test.* 226.

Marot—*moindre* : *paindre*, I–104, *moindre* : *joindre*, I–162,
veine : *Antoine*, I–239, *Antoine* : *souvienne*, I–239, *moins* : *in-*
humains, II–313.

In the light of these rimes certain other combinations,
which would have little argumentative value by themselves,
may be advanced as pointing in the same direction.

Roman de la Rose—*vaine* : *raine* (REGNUM), I–15, *Lohe-*
regne [1] : *regne, ibid.,* I–5.

Rutebuef — *raine* (REGNUM) : *chanoine*, II–119, *regne* :
resne : *saine* : *plaine* : *estraine* : *raisne*, I–127, *raignes* : *raines*
(RANAS), II–90, *vilaine* : *raine* (REGNAT), II–206, *amaine* :
raine (REGNAT), II–254, *tain* (TENEO) : *soucretain*, II–118,
137, 139, *vain* (VENIO) : *vain*, II–139.

Guiot de Provins—*Aquitaine* : *Vienne, Bible* 334, *citoien* :
vilein 998, *Magdalene* : *certene* 2230, *Egipciene* : *Elene* 2248.

Miracles de Nostre Dame—*Estienne* : *maine*, XIV–389.

Eustache Deschamps—*Requiem* : *prouchain* : *moien* : *bien*,
I–XLVIII, *certain* : *cappitain* : *tain* (TENEO), I–CLXXIV, *Ro-*
mains : *Rains* : *plains* : *restrains* : *tiens* : *certains*, II–CCLIII,
plaine : *prouchaine*, I–XII, *paine* : *aviengne*, I–XVI, *craime* [2]
(*crème*) : *aime*, I–XXXIII.

Christine de Pisan—*Athenes* : *certaines*, I, p. 250, *peine* :
Polixenne : *vaine* : *prochaine*, *Débat de Deux Amants* 692,
ancienes : *humaines* : *fontaines* : *mondaines*, *Livre du Dit de*

---

[1] The ending in this word, which can be found elsewhere and earlier, is
evidently due to analogy with *regne*, as if the word meant *the kingdom of
Lorraine.*

[2] The pronunciation is indicated by the rime *baptesme* : *cresme, Mir. d.
Nostre Dame*, XX–643.

Poissy 660, *Magdaleine : peine, Oraison de Nostre Seigneur* 215.

Guillaume Alexis—penne (PENNA) : *penne* (PENA) : *penne* (= Mod. Fr. *panne*), *Le a b c des Doubles* 1056. This unique composition, among other peculiarities, is composed entirely in *rimes équivoquées*, whence the spelling of the second rime word. There can be no doubt about its pronunciation.[1]

L'Amant rendu Cordelier—jenne (=*jeune*) : *mondaine* 169 ; cp. the same combination cited from *Gaufrey* above, p. 655.

Mistère du Viel Testament—Damascene : regne 4341.

Villon—douzaine : Estienne[2] : *paine : sepmaine, Grant Test.* 1913, *roynes : regnes : Renes : estrenes, ibid.* 414, *Neapolitaines : Pruciennes : Egipciennes : Castellaines, ibid.* 1524, *villaine : Helaine, Poésies Diverses* 42, *Magdelaine : laine, ibid.* 53.

Marot—veine : Antoine, I–239, *Antoine : souvienne,* I–239, *tienne : estraine,* I–245, *Magdalaine : Helaine : souveraine :*

---

[1] In view of the positive evidence of this rime and those cited above, *ayme* (AMAT) : *flamme : femme : blasme : flame : enflame, Blason des Faulses Amours,* str. 105, and *clame : l'ame, Passe Temps de tout Homme et de toute Femme* 1083 must be accepted as Latinisms without evidence for the history of our syllables. Similar rimes are cited by Metzke, *Der Dialect von Ile-de-France im 13. und 14. Jahrhundert, Herrig's Archiv,* LXV, p. 61. The same is probably true of *claime : aime : semme* (SEMINAT) : *reme* (=*rame*) in Christine de Pisan, *Débat de deux Amants,* 484.

[2] Villon rimes also *ien* with *ā* as in *ancien : Valerien : an, Grant Test.* 1552. A similar rime is *anciens : sciens* in Guillaume Alexis, *Le a b c des Doubles* 113. The editors Piaget and Picot in a note to this line cite *anciens : Cananeans, Mist. Viel Test.,* III–23050, and *crestiens : ceans,* Montaiglon, *Recueil,* I–53, to emphasize the fact that similar rimes are occasionally found in other authors of this same period. We may add *ancienne : Adriane : sienne,* Guillaume Alexis, *Martyrologue des Fausses Langues* 198, *Adriane : moyenne, ibid.* 209, as showing the same liberty also for the feminine form of this ending. Yet the regular pronunciation of this author was *iēne,* as shown by the rimes *sienne : reviengne, Faintes du Monde* 266 and *preigne : appartiengne, Passe Temps de tout Homme* 3703. Cp. also Nyrop, *Gram.* I, § 218.

seraine, I–337, *Heleine : aveine : alaine : plaine*, I–418, *Philo-
mene : meine*, I–488, *peine : Clymene*, II–175.

We must now face the difficult question how this rather
definite evidence of these rimes extending over a period
covering several centuries can be harmonized with the state-
ments of the early grammarians [1] in regard to the pronuncia-
tion of our syllables. The natural interpretation of the rime
of *ain* or *ein* with *oin* as meaning *ēn : oēn* appears to be
invalidated by the fact that the early grammarians teach that
these syllables arrived in the 16th century with a full
pronunciation of their diphthong. To harmonize this dis-
crepancy it might be argued that the grammarians were
influenced in their statements by the written form of the
syllables. Yet this point of view is scarcely tenable in view
of the rather positive assertions made by the more accurate
among them, who even go so far as to make use of phonetic
transcriptions, as Meigret and Baïf; Cp. Thurot, *l. c.*, p.
342. Or it might be maintained that the popular pro-
nunciation differed from the literary. The people said *ēn*,
but good taste demanded *ēin*. Here we are met by the fact
that the earlier authorities are practically unanimous in their
statements, and that we have in general little evidence of
such discrimination on their part. There seems no possi-
bility of avoiding the acceptance of their testimony as fairly
exact, and if this be so, our problem consists in finding the
explanation which will coördinate their assertions with what
seems to be the evident history of our syllables. In an
article on *The Pronunciation of the French Nasal Vowels in
ain ein in the XVI and XVII Centuries* published some years
ago in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*,
IX, pp. 451–461, I endeavored to interpret this whole body

---

[1] Cp. Thurot, *De la Prononciation Française*, Paris, 1881, vol. I, pp. 321
and 342.

of evidence from this point of view. I now desire to
modify the conclusions reached there to a slight degree, on
the basis of the material presented in this study.

The hidden difficulty of the whole problem probably lies
in the value of the n. The i preceding it being originally a
glide which developed between the nasalized $\tilde{a}$ or $\tilde{e}$ and the
dental n, as in VANUM $>$ $v\tilde{a}in$, PLENUM $>$ $pl\tilde{e}in$, it is evi-
dent that as long as this n kept its original value, which
was the case when the syllables in question were final or
followed by a consonant, or as long as $eine$ was pronounced
$\tilde{e}ine$, the conditions which had produced it originally con-
tinued to be potent, and $\tilde{e}in$ and $\tilde{e}ine$ must have tended to
retain the diphthongal value of their vowels. Here we
have the explanation why the grammarians almost unani-
mously speak of a diphthong in this connection. It is
perfectly possible, to be sure, to pronounce $\tilde{e}n$ without an
intervening i, and that this was often done is proved by the
rime licences which we have observed in the earlier portions
of this study. But it must be borne in mind that, when
$\tilde{e}ins$ rimes with $\tilde{e}ns$, the dental n is still present, and the
rime does not represent the modern pronunciation. And
similarly the union of $eine$ with $oine$ or $ienne$ means $\tilde{e}(i)ne$:
$o\tilde{e}ne$ or $i\tilde{e}ne$, and not $ęne$: $oęne$ or $ięne$.

The fundamental changes, by which the modern value
of our syllables was established, took place during the 16th
century. At that period the dental n disappeared, the
diphthong became a simple vowel, and the nasal vowel in
the feminine syllable became an oral vowel, $\tilde{e}in$ developed
into $\tilde{ę}$ and $\tilde{e}ine$ into $ęnę$. How this change came about must
be a matter of surmise. Probably the diphthong was at
first nasalized throughout, $\tilde{e}in$ became $\tilde{e}\tilde{i}n$, and its second
half then passed rapidly through $\tilde{ę}\tilde{ę}n > \tilde{ę}\tilde{ę}n > \tilde{ę}$. In the
article cited I suggested a shifting of the accent from $\acute{\tilde{ę}}\tilde{ę}n >$
$\tilde{ę}\acute{\tilde{ę}}n$ for the latter half of the century. This presumption

was based upon the interpretation of the statements of
certain of the grammarians, which seem to demand such an
inference.   However, their language is obscure and it is not
impossible that this interpretation is imperfect.   A shift of
the accent is certainly not necessary, for $\acute{\tilde{e}}\tilde{e}n$ can become $\tilde{e}$
quite as easily as $\tilde{e}\acute{\tilde{e}}n$, provided the dental n becomes silent.
In the case of $\tilde{e}ine$ the process was not quite identical.   Here
the nasal quality of the vowel disappeared, and in conse-
quence the diphthong ei was readily reduced to a simple
vowel, but the dental n remained ; $\tilde{e}ine$ become ene.

If this point of view is accurate, the Old French rimes
harmonize perfectly with the evidence of the 16th century
grammarians, and it is seen that the growth of our syllables
was constantly in a uniform direction toward their Modern
French value.

III.

We may now turn to a group of texts in which the
development made evident so far has not taken place, and
where, on the contrary, *ein* has become *ain*.

Texts in assonances showing this development are enu-
merated by Engelmann, *l. c.*, pp. 22 ff.   The evidence is
contained in the *laisses* having *ai* and *ei* + *nasal* in asso-
nance with *a* or *e* + *nasal* + *consonant*.   Since *an* and *en*
have here undoubtedly the value of $\tilde{a}n$, it follows that *ain*
and *ein* were pronounced $\tilde{a}in$.   Cp. the following assonances:

Aie d'Avignon—*comence* : *Elainne* : *dame*, p. 53.

Aiol—*porpensent* : *Losane* : *Bretaigne* : *renge*, ll. 8768 ff.,
bataille : *Chartres* : *kaine* (CATENA) : *arse*, ll. 8800 ff.

Ogier—*demain* : *grant* 2318, *France* : *atendre* 5970, *gentes* :
Romaine 8497, *lantaine* : *cravente* : *poissance* 9034.

Renaus de Montauban—*Karlesmaine* : *remaigne* : *ceigne* :
ensamble : *Flandre* : *Romaine* 142.

Amis et Amiles—*parrain* : *main* : *desirrans* : *approchant*: *vaillant* : *gaaing* : *sain* : *Romains* : *serjant* 2499, *plains* (PLENUS) : *sains* : *mains* : *certain* 3080, *couvent* : *volant* : *gent* : *serjans* : *forment* 1803.

Jourdains de Blaivies—*Jordains* : *dolans* : *vans* (VENTUS) 2192, *parrain* : *certain* : *Jordain* 3034.

Very often *aigne* and *eigne* are joined to the words cited. To introduce these into the discussion at this point is contrary to the plan of this study, the object being to establish the pronunciation of *ain(e)* and *ein(e)* as a basis for the further elucidation of the history of *aigne* and *eigne*. It is sufficient therefore for our purpose at this point to note that in the texts cited above both *ain* and *ein* were unquestionably *ãin*.

The search for similar proof in the rimed texts has proved rather fruitless. I am able, however, to cite the following pairs of *ain* : *an*—*Richars li Biaus*, *bans* (= *banc*) : *a(i)ns* 2007, *main* : *Flamain* (= *flamand*) 1607, *Floris et Liriope*, *meshaing* : *awan* 563, *Rom. de Renart*, *vilein* : *Brian* I b, 2981, *Octavian*, *ata[i]nt* : *garant* 2287.

While these assonances and rimes are few in number, it is interesting to note the rather circumscribed territory to which the majority of these texts belong. All have distinct Picard characteristics. *Aiol* and *Renaut de Montauban* are classified by Gröber, *Grundriss*, as Francian-Picard. *Richars li Biaus* is placed by Förster, ed. p. IX, in the neighborhood of the French-Belgian frontier, and Knauer [1] agrees in the main with this localisation. *Octavian* is a Picard text copied by an Anglo-Norman scribe.

In view of these facts the Picard origin of the trait under consideration becomes a pertinent inquiry. The help of the assonances and rimes being exhausted, our only resource can

---

[1] *Zur altfranzösischen Lautlehre*, Leipzig, 1876.

be the orthography, to be studied primarily in charters and
original documents. Here we must move very cautiously,
and conclusions can be established only within certain limi-
tations. Yet where we find *ẹ + n* written constantly *ain, ein*
being almost unknown, the inference is certainly justified,
that in the opinion of the scribes the pronunciation was ren-
dered more accurately by *ain* than by *ein*. Such is the case
in the texts studied by Raynaud, *Le Dialecte Picard dans le
Ponthieu*, Paris, 1876. In these original documents extend-
ing over the years 1254–1333 the orthography *ein* seems
unknown ; cp. p. 67. The same is true of the documents
of Champagne examined by Förster as the basis for his
study of the language of Chrestien de Troies, cp. *Cliges*,
pp. lxi–lxii. The same predominance of *ain* we find in the
manuscripts of the following texts examined for the present
purpose : *Aucassin et Nicolete, Dis dou vrai Aniel, Richars
li Biaus, Ille et Galeron, Trouvères Belges (Beaudouin de
Condé, Jean de Condé, Quenes de Béthune, Jacques de Bai-
sieux), Guillaume de Palerne, Jean Bodel (Jeu de Saint
Nicolas), Adam de la Halle, (Jeu de la Feuillée, Robin et
Marion), Floris et Liriope, Robert le Diable, Durmart, Cheva-
lier as deus Espees, Raoul de Houdenc, Philippe de Beau-
manoir, Chronique de Floreffe,*[1] *Froissart.* If the argument
of the orthography is of any value the pronunciation *āin* for
both *ain* and *ein* should be ascribed to these texts.

It is possible to control this conclusion to a certain extent
by comparison with the modern dialects. Gilliéron's monu-
mental speech atlas [2] (the first 16 fascicules) contains a number
of maps of service in this connection. These tabulate the
pronunciation of the words *bain, andain, main, essaim, étain,
faim, douzaine, chaîne, faîne.* For all of them the pre-

---

[1] Cp. Peters, *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, **xxi**, p. 12.

[2] *Atlas Linguistique de la France* por Gilliéron et Edmond, Champion,
Paris.

10

ponderance of pronunciation in the whole *langue d'oïl* territory is $\tilde{e}$ or en. However there are two regions where $\tilde{a}$ or $\tilde{a}n$ with various shades of vowel are the rule. These are the Northern portion of the department of Manche with sporadic instances in Calvados, and particularly the Northern portion of Somme and the department of Pas de Calais, going now and then over into the contiguous territory. The same pronunciation is cited by Eggert, *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, XIII, pp. 375 and 380, for the patois of Val de Saire, La Hague, Guernsey, and Jersey, and corroborated for the dialect of Guernsey by Lewis, *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, X, pp. 18–19 and 27–28. Now it is, of course, entirely possible that we have here a modern development of older en and ene. Yet, if the development of *ein* into $\bar{\imath}$ current in Modern Wallonian is taken into consideration, cp. Gilliéron's *Atlas* and Horning, *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, IX, pp. 482 and 484, together with that into $\bar{o}n$ as in $v\bar{o}n$ (VENA) $av\bar{o}n$ (AVENA) $p\bar{o}n$ (PŒNA) in the same region, where an older *ei* had become *oi* under the influence of a preceding labial, the conclusion is made rather probable that the basis of this modern $\tilde{a}$ is an older $\tilde{a}in$.

Now it is striking to note the number of texts in the list just cited, which fall into the region described in a general way by the words departments of Pas de Calais, Nord, and Somme, though to be sure not all of them can be definitely assigned to this section. This is the territory of the Picard dialect, and these two facts taken together seem to establish the conclusion that the development of *ein* to *ain*, made evident by the overwhelming use of *ain* as the graphic expression of the sound, is a characteristic of the Picard dialect extending South into the Francian and Champenois.

The further question of the geographical expansion of this trait the material at hand does not solve entirely. We can give, however, some indications. According to Förster's

observations[1] it included the district of Champagne, and in that case the same pronunciation must be assigned to the *Roman de Galeran*, whose home probably lies in the department of Aisne. But its spread was stopped by the Burgundian dialects, where, as is well known, *ein* became *oin*, while *ain* remained, thus showing that the two syllables had not coincided. This is the condition in the *Lyon Yzopet*,[2] though this text contains one rime, *rainne* (RANA) : *poinne* (PŒNA) 165, of *a + n* with *ẹ + n*. The evidence collected by Görlich, *Der Burgundische Dialekt im xiii und xiv Jahrhundert*,[3] corroborates this statement. In the documents examined by him *a + n* is represented by *ain* and *ein*, very rarely by *oin*, p. 18, while *ẹ + n* appears regularly as *oin*, *ein*, *ain*, pp. 62 ff. Görlich is inclined to look upon *ain* in the latter case either as a stage in the development of *ein* to *oin*, or as a later secondary alteration of *oin*, but does not at all associate it with *ain* from *a + n*. Further North in Lorraine both *a + n* and *ẹ + n* are written *ain*, *ein* and *en*, as, for instance, in the *Lorraine Psalter*, and Apfelstedt, the editor[4] of the text attributes the value of *ẽ* to these various spellings. Occasionally the more Southern *oin* has crept in, but the former value is confirmed by the modern forms of the words in question. In the patois spoken between Metz and Belfort *a + n* has become *ẹ̃*, while *ẹ + n* is *ĩ*, except after a labial, in which case it has become *ǫ* or *ǫn*; cp. Horning, *Die Ostfranzösischen Grenzdialekte zwischen Metz und Belfort, Franz. Stud.*, v (1887), pp. 9 and 29–30.

Outside of the Burgundian-Lorraine region and yet closely related to it we may cite the *Roman de Fortune et Félicité* of the 14th century by Renaut de Louhans studied by Nagel

---

[1] *Cliges* von Christian von Troyes, p. lxii.

[2] Cp. Förster's edition of this text, *Altfrz. Bibl.*, v, pp. xxvii and xxxi.

[3] *Französische Studien*, xii (1889).

[4] *Lothringischer Psalter, Altfrz. Bibl.*, iv, pp. xii–xiii and xxi.

in *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, xv, pp. 1–24. We there find such rimes
as *plainne* (PLENA) : *enciénne* : *fontainne* : *certainne, terrïennes* :
vainnes, sains : *fisiciens, chastellains* : *gardiens, biens* : *mains*
which, though not entirely conclusive, yet seem to point
rather toward the pronunciation *ẹ̃n(e)*. In the direction of
the Wallonian we have the *Poème Moral* and the *Chronique*
of Philippe Mousket. Neither text allows satisfactory con-
clusions. The former seems to demand *ãin* for both *a* and
ẹ + n, but the argument is based entirely on the orthog-
raphy,[1] and is unsatisfactory. Philippe Mousket rimes *ain*
and *ein*, and often *ain* is written for both.[2] The present
dialect of Namur, East of Tournai the probable home of
Philippe Mousket, has *ẹ̃* for both syllables; cp. Nieder-
länder, *Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, xxiv, pp. 7 and 22.

Toward the West and Southwest the *ãin* region also had
its definite limits. We may note the *Roman de Carité et
Miserere* written probably at Molliens-Vidamé near Amiens;
cp. the edition of this text by van Hamel, Paris, 1885,
p. cxcv. Here we find in strophe 41 of the *Miserere* the
rime *pena* : *peine a*, which gives definite evidence for the
pronunciation *pẽine* at least. The modern dialects around
Amiens vary between *ẹ̃* and *ã*; cp. Sütterlin, *Heutige Pikard-
isch-Französische Mundarten, Zs. f. rom. Phil.*, xxvi, pp. 289
and 297.

Before leaving this portion of our study it is necessary to
discuss briefly the *Estoire de la Guerre Sainte* written soon
after the year 1191 by Ambroise, an ordinary knight of the
third crusade in the army of Richard. Gaston Paris localized
this poem at Evreux. The text shows the usual confusion
in the rimes of *ain(e)* and *ein(e)*, *aindre* and *eindre*, *aint(e)*
and *eint(e)* and no proof for the pronunciation could be

---

[1] Cloetta, *Poème Moral, Rom. Forsch.*, iii, pp. 49, 58 and 61.
[2] Link, *Die Sprache der Chronique Rimée*, Erlangen, 1882.

drawn from these, though Gaston Paris, p. xxvii of the edition, accepts *āin* as the common value. The difficulty arises through the rimes of *aine* and *eine* with *iene*. We have here such pairs as *Estienes* : *paienes* 10488, *cristiaine* : *paiene* 6353, *teriane* : *cristiane* 41, 3711, ·3975, *cristiane* : *paaine* 2323, 3929, *chaane* (CATENA) : *cristiane* 3388, *chaane* : *paiane* 3935. On the basis of the last two pairs Gaston Paris believed (p. xxvii) that a double pronunciation of *iene* must be accepted, viz., on the one hand the normal one in *paiene crestiene*, and on the other *paiaine crestiaine*. It is certain that the localization of this text at Evreux does not actually conflict with the argument which may be based upon the modern patois of this region ; cp. above p. 664. But on the other hand the evidence for *āin* is absent, except such as may be drawn from the orthography ; and it will be seen that this may be explained otherwise. It should be noted in the first place that with the exception of *chaane* the ending *ane* is restricted to *teriane, cristiane*, and *paiane*, three common mediæval words, whose Latin forms were familiar to every copyist and might readily affect the French form without influencing the pronunciation. If this point of view be valid, *chaane* would then be merely an adaptation of the word to its mate in rime. If the scribe said *cristiene* and wrote *cristiane*, he could also write *chaane* and mean *chaaine*, which he couples with *demaine*, l. 9006. A double pronunciation is imaginable for *cristiene*, but scarcely for *chaeine*. In the next place it should be observed that *aine* meant *ẽne* for the scribe, which is evident from the following series of rimes : *Avesne* : *regne* 6177, 6637, *Charlemaines* : *regnes* 8479, *regne* : *cheveitaigne* 8607, *cheventaine* : *lointaine* 7087, *cristiaine* : *paiene* 6353. Unless we are much mistaken, therefore, the matter is much less complicated than Gaston Paris imagined, and we have in the language of Ambroise in this particular another example of the type of *R. Troie, B. Chron.*, and other texts examined above, p. 651.

The present investigation has shown, I think, two things.
On the one hand a continuous line of assonances and rimes
has been cited proving the development of *ain* in the direc-
tion of $\bar{e}in > \bar{e}n$, belonging to the Norman and subsequent
Francian dialect, and on the other evidence has been brought
forward showing that $\bar{e}in$ had become $\tilde{a}in$ and $\tilde{a}n$ in a por-
tion of the Picard and neighboring speech forms.

IV.

AIGNE—EIGNE.

While the mingling of *aine* and *eine* in rime is frequent
in French texts after the *Brandan*, the similar fusion of
aigne and *eigne* became customary much more slowly.
Of the Anglo-Norman texts in our list the first to show it
is the *Mist. Adam.* Here we have, ll. 618–621, the follow-
ing sequence of rimes with partial assonance : *enseigne* :
feigne : *guerre* : *pleigne*. The inference that both *aigne* and
eigne were pronounced $\bar{e}\acute{n}e$ it is of course impossible to avoid.

Yet in spite of this long silence of the rimes on this point,
scrutiny of the earlier texts shows that this pronunciation
must have been common since the beginning of the 12th
century. In the *Brandan aigne* rimes with *aine* (*semaine* :
cumpaine 592) and *eigne* with *eine* (*meinet* : *enseignet* 714,
1114 ; cp. also ll. 215, 1110, 1252). Since *aine* and *eine*
are identical in sound, it follows that the absence of the rime
pair *aigne* : *eigne* cannot be due to a difference in pronuncia-
tion, and the same inference is legitimate also for the other
texts of this period ; cp. *St. Laurent, ovraigne* : *peine* 67,
Adgar, overaigne : *peine* 2–99, 23–237, *desdeign* : *vilain* 30–
151. In the 13th century the fusion of the two syllables
in rime is more frequent ; cp. *Angier, Gregoire, gaaingne* :
enseigne 147, *enfreingne* : *destreingne* 911, *enseingne* : *remeingne*

983, *Chardry, Set Dorm., muntainne* : *enseinne* 911, *Guil-
laume le Maréchal, enseigne* : *remaigne* 2947, *enseigne* : *acom-
paigne* 3395, *pleingne* : *enseigne* 3823, *plaingne* : *ensenne* 4805,
Bretaingne : *ensaingne* 6505.

No deductions claiming a conscious separation of the sylla-
bles in rime or inferences as to a difference of pronunciation
should, however, be drawn from the fact that such rimes
even at this time are not more frequent. This proportion is
determined entirely by the nature of the words in point.
Those with *aigne* are on the whole more frequently employed
than those with *eigne*, and this comparative relation is quite
well illustrated by the *Ipomedon* of Hue de Rotelande. In
the 10578 lines of this poem I have noted only one example
of fusion of the two syllables, *desdegne* : *gregne* 2389. At the
same time *eigne* occurs only once in rime by itself, l. 5161,
and pure *aigne* rimes are frequent.

On the continent the general picture is closely similar.
The *Eneas* keeps *aigne* and *eigne* separate. There are 12
rimes in *aigne* (ll. 365, 3147, 4109, 4535, 5003, 5563, 6983,
7099, 7781, 8033, 9509, 10007), 4 in *eigne* (ll. 4523, 5569,
9485, 9897) and one of *aigne* with *regne, regne* : *plaigne*
1427. That *eigne* also might have rimed with *regne* is
proved by *enseigne* : *demeine* 4523 and *regne* : *peine* 2523.
The *R. Rou* contains 23 pure *aigne* rimes (ll. 25, 427, 515,
661, 671, 1513, 1831, 2597, 2629, 2697, 3931, 3937, 4115,
4481, 5095, 6099, 7593, 7951, 8685, 8715, 8717, 8719,
9143), 2 pure *eigne* rimes (ll. 1629, 3941) and only one
instance of fusion, *deigne* : *greigne* 2607. We have seen
above, p. 643, that Wace follows the same habit for *ain* and
ein, but that it would be dangerous to base conclusions upon
this fact, because fusion of these two syllables in rime is much
more constant in the same author's *Brut*, and we may add
here that this same text contains a rime showing mingling
of *aigne* with *iegne*, (*vaigne* : *Bretaigne* 6072), a type which
we shall presently meet in other texts.

The majority of the Norman texts in our list presents the
same appearance as those just considered. The *Chron. Mt.
S. Mich.* has 8 rimes in point, all in *aigne* (ll. 49, 501, 565,
783, 1131, 1491, 1649, 2277). The last in this list is
enfregne : *maigne*, but here the source of the first word is
INFRANGERE in the place of INFRINGERE. The *Liv. d.
Man.* has only a single strophe (cciv) in *aigne* (*Espaigne* :
bargaigne : *gaine* : *ateigne*), Marie de France does not mix
these syllables in rime, either in the *Fables* or in the *Lais*
with the exception of a single example to be cited presently.
Beroul has 3 rimes in *aigne* (731, 2247, 4029), 2 showing
fusion,[1] *saine* (*SANGINAT*) : *enseigne* 777, *enseigne* : *Montaigne*
4017 and none in *eigne*. In Guillaume le Clerc's *Besant de
Dieu* and *Bestiaire* there are 14 rimes divided as follows :
5 in *aigne*, Bes. Dieu 2355, 3213, *Best*. 149, 365, 1849 ; 4
in *eigne*, *Best*. 1247, 2941, 3075, 3601; and 5 showing
fusion : *Bes. Dieu desdeign* : *meheign* 1767, *enpaigne* (IM-
PINGAT) : *plaingne* 1903, *ovraignes* : *enseignes* 2095, *Best.
enseigne* : *remaigne* 1571, *montaigne* : *enseigne* 2817. In the
Clef d'Amours finally we note *aigne* pure 1437, *eigne* pure
2847 and *ouvrengne* : *ensengne* 2061, *compaignes* : *enseignes*
3133. That is to say, we have in these texts, taken as a
whole, a majority of *aigne* rimes, due to conditions which
throw no light on the pronunciation, a very much smaller
number of *eigne* rimes, and constant examples of fusion
between the two, showing that their pronunciation was
identical.

We may now cite the rimes in these texts which aid in
determining the pronunciation. These are in the first place
regne : *plaigne*, *Eneas* 1427, *regne* : *peine*, *ibid*. 2523, *preigne*
(*PRENDEAM*) : *feigne*, *Marie de France*, *Lanval* 131, *pleig-*

---

[1] In view of this fact *fange* : *enseigne* 3801 and *enseigne* : *barnage* 4109 must
be looked upon as doubtful readings ; cp. also Muret, *ed.*, p. xliv.

nent : *blasteignent, ibid. Fables* 23–25, *entracompaignent* :
espraignent, Best. 2903. These must be considered in con-
nection with certain rime pairs in Benoît de Sainte-More.
In both poems commonly attributed to this author the
commonest rimes are *aigne : aigne, eigne : eigne* and *aigne :
eigne,* but in addition there are found a few in *aigne* or *eigne*
with *iegne* as follows : *teigne : remaigne, R. Troie* 12985,
teigne : chastaigne, ibid. 16851, *teigne : enseigne, ibid.* 18407,
teigne : maigne, B. Chron. 17557, and also *aigne :* *PRENDEAM
as *ovraigne : preigne, B. Chron.* 19475, *compaigne : empreigne,
ibid.* 22601. That is to say we have here more extended
evidence of a rime tendency just noted for Wace's *Brut* and
Marie de France. The *Clef d'Amours* points in the same
direction with *plengne : tiengne* 613, *ensengne : contiengne*
2737, *prengnes : restraingnes* 401, and *prenge : avienge* 1143,
contiengent : mesprengent 2067, *prenge : retienge* 2083, *aprenges :
contienges* 2899, which are probably only variant spellings for
the same phonetic value.

Presumably this value was *ẽǹe*, but of course the rimes
themselves contain no evidence and it is quite conceivable
that TENEAM and *PRENDEAM were pronounced *tãǹe* and
prãǹe. There is, however, another set of rimes in Benoît
showing mixture of *aigne* and *eigne*, with *aine* and *eine*,
similar to those already noted for the earlier Anglo-Norman
texts, and these throw very definite light on our problem ;
cp. *Seigne* (SEQUANA) : *Bretaigne, B. Chron.* 15044, *Seigne :
compaigne, ibid.* 39751, *chevetaingne : conpaingne, R. Troie*
20419, *Heleine : chevetaingne, ibid.* 25863, *estreine : Heleine,
ibid.* 5069. Whatever vowel existed in *aine* or *eine* must
have been heard also in *aigne* and *eigne*, and since this
tended in the direction of *ẽne*, cp. above, p. 651, it follows
that *aigne* and *eigne* were sounded *ẽǹe*, and the rime *regne :
plaigne, Eneas* 1427 agrees with this inference.

We may conclude, therefore, that in the Anglo-Norman

and Norman dialects both *aigne* and *eigne* were pronounced
ẽñe, *PRENDEAM was *prẽñe* and TENEAM, VENIAM had
become *tiẽñe, viẽñe* with further development into *tẽñe* and
vẽñe.

In our study of the history of *ain* and *ein*, after the
determination of the value of these syllables in Anglo-
Norman and Norman, we were led through the *Escoufle* and
Guillaume de Dole into a series of texts where these syllables
rime with *oin*. Only Rutebeuf of our list shows the similar
mixture of *aigne* and *eigne* with *oigne*. Since the latter was
pronounced *oẽñe*, there can be no question as to the value
of the former. Note the following rimes : *remeigne* : *enseigne*,
I–71, *remeigne* : *preigne*, I–71, *preigne* : *deigne*, I–150, *main-
teingne* : *veingne* : *compeingne* : *esloigne*, I–22, *poingne* : *so-
vrainne* : *moinne* : *essoinne*, I–163, *avaloingnes* : *lontaingnes* :
essoingnes, I–241, *enseigne* : *besoingne*, II–85, *ouvraingne* :
vergoingne, II–176, *coviegne* : *besoingne*, II–184, *souviegne* :
besoingne, II–294, *doingne* : *viengne*, II–376, *praingne* : *be-
soingne*, II–311. Since REGNUM, written *raine, raigne*, or
règne, rimes with this same class of words, cp. I–101, 127,
II–90, 206, 254, 283, 365, it follows that all were pro-
nounced alike.[1]

The same fusion of the syllables in question with *oigne* is
to be found in the list of assonances from Gaufrey, p. 316,
already cited in part above, p. 655. To the words mentioned

---

[1] Metzke, *Herrig's Archiv*, LXV, p. 60, calls attention to the fact that
proper names like *Champaingne Alemaingne* in the Francian documents
studied by him are never written with *e* or *ei*, and that forms like *Cham-
pagne, montagne* are not infrequent. This leads him to accept the modern
pronunciation for the words in question. But the rimes which he cites
from Geffroi de Paris and Gautier de Coincy, in addition to those from
Rutebeuf and other authors included in the present study, show such
absolute equivalence of *aigne* and *eigne*, that it follows that their value
must have been identical, and in a note on p. 62 he hesitatingly withdraws
his previous conclusion.

there, add *demaine* : *compegne* : *essoigne* : *ensengne* : *castengne* : *Couloigne* : *Sessoigne* : *grifaingne* : *Espengne* : *vergoigne* : *compengne* : *gaaigne* : *entente* : *jenne* (=*jeune*) : *essoigne* : *quarantaine* : *besongne* : *demouraine*.

The earliest texts ascribed by Suchier, *Altfrz. Gram.*, pp. 2–3, to this region cannot enter into the argument. The *Vie de Saint Thomas* has no rimes in point, and Marie de France, as we have seen, scarcely has either syllable at the end of the line. The still earlier texts, as the *Voyage Charl.* and the *Couron. Louis*, show only *aigne* in assonance with *a*; cp. *Charlemaignes* : *compaignes* : *France* : *remaignet* : *plaigne*, *Voy. Charl.* 783, *Charlemaigne* : *Alemaigne* : *Bretaigne* : *reiames* : *France*, *Couron. Louis* 10, a fact to be expected from the age of these poems. That neither should contain an assonance showing *eigne* : *e* is probably to be explained in a similar way as the relative proportion of *aigne* and *eigne* rimes in the later texts.

If we now look at the texts cited above, pp. 656 ff., in which evidence for the value of *ēn* = *ain* and *ein* can be found, we shall be able to observe some rather definite criteria for our problem in the case of some of them, while we shall find a great deal of obscurity in the case of others. Maistre Elie in his *Art d'Amour* rimes *aigne* : *eigne* and *PRENDEAM; cp. *remaigne* : *ensaigne* 856, *compaigne* : *preigne* 370, *grevaigne* : *peine* 737, *ensaing* : *desdaing* 785. The author of the *Escoufle* joins *saigne* (SIGNAT) : *montaigne* 5089, *plaigne* (PLANEA) : *prengne* 1125, *daigne* : *prengne* 7839, *compaigne* : *aviegne* 5277, *remaingne* : *aviengne* 1675, *remaigne* : *raigne* (REGNUM) 2221, *Loheraigne* : *raigne* 5477, *i. e.*, *aigne*, *eigne*, *egne*, *iegne* and REGNUM rime in such a way that the conclusion is obligatory that all were pronounced alike either *āñe* or *ēñe*. Now in this same text *ain* and *ein* are probably *ēn*, cp. above, p. 655, and since *losenge*, which rimes with *vos ain ge* 2877, is coupled with *aveigne* 7459, we are justified

in accepting *ēñe* as the pronunciation of the author. *Guillaume de Dole*, which furnishes the earliest example of the fusion of *ain* with *oin* rimes *plaigne* : *Alemaigne* 3771, 5562, *enmainent* : *remaignent* 4085, and *Champaigne* : *apregne* 5, *regne* : *graine* 7, *regne* : *deerraine* 4134. The remaining rimes in point have *a* as tonic vowel, as ll. 972, 1084, 1654, 2560, 3068, 3542, or *ę* as 3582. If *aine* is correctly determined as *ēine*, then *regne* must be *rēñe* or *rēne* and *aigne* was pronounced *ēñe* as is proved by the filiation of *regne* : *aine* : *eine* : *aigne*.

The *R. Rose* also joined *ain* and *oin*. Here we find *aigne* : *eigne* (*Bretaigne* : *enseigne*, I–39), *aigne* : *iegne* (*compaigne* : *tiengne*, I–9), *eigne* : *iegne* (*enseigne* : *tiengne*, I–68), *aigne* : *PRENDEAM (*refraigne* : *sorpreigne*, I–101, *prengne* : *chastengne*, II–215), *eigne* : *PRENDEAM (*preigne* : *feingne*, I–321, *prengne* : *faingne*, II–129). Since *saine* rimes with *essoine*, I–73, and *poine* with *moine* (MONACHUS), I–100, we may accept *vaine* : *raine* (REGNUM), I–15 as meaning *vēne* : *rēne*, and we may infer that *aigne* and *eigne* were pronounced *ēñe*. In support of this conclusion we may cite also *lointaignes* : *taignes* (TENEAS), I–59, *lointaingne* : *tiengne*, II–216, and *Loheregne* : *règne*, I–25.

The *Miracles de Nostre Dame* show *maines* : *enseignes*, XII–580, *montaigne* : *ensaingne*, XX–449, *Bretaingne* : *reteingne*, XVII–883, *deigne* : *veigne*, IX–20, *deigne* : *esconveigne*, XIII–408, *viengne* : *enseigne*, XXI–535, XXII–1397, *aprengne* : *tiengne*, VI–392, *appartiengne* : *mesprengne*, VIII–1138. One rime, *compaigne* : *espargne*, III–1079, seems indeed to speak for the pronunciation *āñe*, but *Charles d' Orléans* has *espergne* : *preigne* : *enseigne* : *apreigne*, II–85 showing the correct form. For similar evidence cp. *espergne* : *Auverne*, B. *Chron.* 5039, *espergne* : *cerne*, *ibid.* 16258, *taverne* : *espergne*, R. *Rose*, I–168, *esparne* : *superne*, *Besant Dieu* 3167, and even as late as Marot we can find *espergne* : *Auvergne*, II–14.

The remaining texts[1] of this list present the following examples :

Eustache Deschamps — *paine : aviengne : empraigne : aviengne*, I–XVI, *montaigne : souspraingne*, I–LXXXII, *aviengne : plaingne : demaine : maine* and *empraingne : souvieingne : praingne : incertaine*, I–CII, *aviengne : Bretaingne : souviengne : reprangne*, I–CLVII, *foraine : Bretaigne*, II–CXCII, *reviengne : repraingne : maintiengne : enseigne*, II–CCXLVIII, *layne : apprengne : ensaigne : craingne : aviengne*, II–CCCV.

Guillaume Alexis—*Espaigne : peigne*, *Le a b c des Doubles* 485, *attaine* (= *atteigne*) *: hayne*, *Passe Temps de tout Homme et de toute Femme* 2897, *montaigne : enseigne*, *ibid.* 3535, *preigne : appartiengne*, *ibid.* 3703, *daigne : baigne*, *ibid.* 4323.

Villon—*Auvergne : Charlemaigne*, *Grant Test.* 382, *Bretaigne : enseigne : tiengne*, *ibid.* 1629, *paine : attaine* (= *atteigne*), *Poés. Div.* 190, *douzaine : Estienne : paine : sepmaine*, *Grant Test.* 1913, *Royne* (= *roęne*) *: paine*, *ibid.* 1151, *Roynes : regnes : Renes : estrenes*, *ibid.* 414.

Marot—Only *contraignent : preignent*, I–146, and *daigne : enseigne : preigne : appreigne*, II–47, Epigram CXXII, *Espaigne : baigne*, I–259, 345, *montaigne : baigne*, I–470, 485, II–165, *baigne : gaigne*, II–152 show the older tradition. Most of the rimes in point agree with the modern pronunciation as

---

[1] *Christine de Pisan's* rimes are very unsatisfactory in this connection. The following list includes all those of interest, and no conclusions can be based upon them. The volumes examined contain no *eigne* rimes whatever, and no fusion of *aigne : eigne*. All rimes in point are exceedingly rare ; cp. *Alemagne : remagne*, *Livre du Duc des Vrais Amants* 717, *remaigne : Alemaigne*, *ibid.* 1709, *mahagnent : empregnent*, *Epistre au Dieu d'Amours* 645, *prengne : Bretaigne : compaigne : Alemaigne*, *Débat de Deux Amans* 1552. Nyrop, *Gram. Hist.*, I, p. 196, cites *Bretaigne : empreigne*, *Chemin de l. Estude* 3695. I may add here, because of similar interest and limited scope, *enseing : repreing*, *Guiot de Provins*, *Bible*, 1440, *praingne : Champaigne*, *Crieries de Paris*, 39, *souvienne : preingne*, *Mist. du Viel Testament* 1168, *advienne : preingne*, *ibid.* 3338.

campaigne : *Espaigne,* I–63, and I–117, 153, 195, 197, 232, 434 and *enseigne* : *enseigne* : *contraigne,* I–82 and 125, 178.

The material presented in the preceding pages lacks without question here and there the precision that one would like to see in an argument of this kind. However, no other criteria are available. The answer to this vexing question must be sought in the rimes, and from the nature of things their meaning must be unraveled with care, and certainly without prejudice. This we have endeavored to do. We have shown that in the Norman dialect *aigne* and *eigne* must have had the value of *ēñe.* Passing into the Francian, we have found evidence of the same pronunciation through the mingling of these syllables with *oigne,* while at the same time they rimed with *iegne* and *PRENDEAM. Then we have seen *oigne* disappearing from this group, but we have noticed the others holding together until Marot's time. The rimes cited from Eustache Deschamps, Guillaume Alexis, and Villon show *aine* and *eine* mixed with them besides, and we have seen these latter in a previous chapter definitely used with the value of *ēne.* The conclusion which is forced upon us is inevitable. From the end of the 12th century until the time of Marot *aigne* and *eigne* in the Francian dialect both had the identical value of *ēñe.* There now remains the problem how the modern readjustment of these syllables into *añe* and *ęñe* is to be explained.

V.

Before taking up the consideration of this question we may study the history of *aigne* and *eigne* in the region where *ain* and *ein* had the value of *ãn.* Engelmann, *l. c.,* pp. 22–23, cites a few assonances showing the value of *ãñe* for both syllables. These are *lances* : *ensaignes* : *grifaigne* : *France,*

Charrois de Nîmes 975 ; *estrange* : *demande* : *regne* : *France* : *Alemaigne*, *Prise d'Orenge* 179. We may add *porpensent* : *Losane* : *Bretaigne* : *prendre* : *lance*, Aïol, CCXXII ; *descendre* : *ensengne* : *Franche* : *Losane* : *Charlemaine* : *pendre* : *feme*, *ibid.* CCXXV ; *chatainne* : *demande* : *mainnes* : *France*, *Amis et Amiles* 517 ; *chatainnes* : *Charlemainne* : *estraingnes* : *entrent*, *ibid.* 2042 ; *demorance* : *montaingne* : *lance*, *Jourdains de Blaivies* 1646.

The rimed texts present no similar evidence. The rime *bangne* : *espargne*, *Jacques de Baisieux*, *Trois Chev.* 247 is of interest mainly on account of the orthography of the first word, but the rime itself is not entirely above suspicion since *espargne* might be a graphic variant for *espergne*, though this is scarcely probable in this dialect. *Demanois* : *espaignois*, *Chev. as deus espees* 2767, is also striking for the same reason. The second word is *espanois* < HISPANENSIS, and the sylla- ble *an* could be written *aign* only by a scribe for whom *aign* meant ãń.

Nor will the words with which *aigne* and *eigne* are coupled in rime serve to throw light on the problem. We find here, as before, *iegne* and *PRENDEAM. Only REGNUM seems absent and limited to rimes with *aine* and *eine*. Not all the texts, however, join all these syllables. All four, *aigne* : *eigne* : *iegne* : *PRENDEAM, are found in *Ille et Galeron*, *Guillaume de Palerne*, *Richars li Biaus* and *Philippe de Beau- manoir* ; *aigne* : *eigne* : *PRENDEAM rime in the *Chevalier as deus Espees* and the *Roman de Galeran* ; and *aigne* : *eigne* only are coupled in *Durmart*, *Robert le Diable* and Froissart's *Meliador*. I do not add examples here to illustrate the nature of these rimes. A few specimens of each type could give no idea of the actual exclusion of the others and their general appearance will become sufficiently clear from the citations given for another purpose below.

It follows that we have the same groups of rime words to

deal with as before, and the question of their pronunciation cannot be solved with the evidence which they contain. The only remaining avenue of approach is the orthography. We are aware, of course, of the care that must be exercised in basing an argument on such data. Yet certain orthographic habits can be observed in these texts which are incompatible with the pronunciation *ẽ́ne*.

1. *Eigne, iegne,* and **PRENDEAM* are constantly written *aigne.* Cf. *entresaigne* : *baigne, Ille et Galeron,* 568, *Bretaigne* : *taigne* (= *tienne*), *ibid.* 305, *ouvragne* : *vaigne* (= *vienne*), *Baudoin de Condé,* XXI–503, *empraignent* : *espaignent, Guill. de Palerne* 9199, *convaigne* : *compaigne, ibid.* 5201, *conpaigne* : *ensaigne, Robert le Diable* 3115, *chaigne* (= CINGAT) : *deschaigne, Chev. as deus Esp.* 781, *Bretaigne* : *praigne, Galeran* 1620, *praigne* : *remaigne, Manekine* 449, *vaigne* (= *vienne*) : *remaigne, ibid.* 2069. A complete list of the available examples would serve no purpose, for it would fail to give an idea of the proportion of *aigne* outside of the rime in comparison with the other ways of spelling the syllable, but the constant recurrence of the *aigne* form in these texts compared with its more restricted employment in the *ẽ́ne* group, gives it nevertheless the force of a valuable argument at least for the speech of the scribes who copied the manuscripts.

2. The parasitic *i* is often and in some texts quite regularly omitted. Cf. *Bretagne* : *adagne, Ille et Galeron* 1683, *remagne* : *Alemagne, ibid.* 2663, *dagne* : *ensagne, ibid.* 382, *desdang* : *faing, ibid.* 5407, *engagne* : *gaagne, Rich. li Biaus* 4189, *Espagne* : *compagne, ibid.* 4899, *Bretagne* : *estragne Meliador* 2776.

3. *Eigne* and **PRENDEAM* are written *egne* and *engne.* Cf. *ensengne* : *estraigne, Rich. li Biaus,* 3887, *pregne* : *compaigne, Ille et Galeron* 4803, *adengne* : *daingne, Jean de Condé,* XXXV–13, *ensengne* : *mehangne, Jacques de Baisieux,* V *lettres de Marie* 195, *plaingne* : *prengne, Guill. de. Pal.*

6697, *ensenges* : *montaignes*, *Rob. le Diable* 637, 1809, *en-senges* : *estranges*, *ibid.* 899, *ensegne* : *estraigne*, *ibid.* 2853, *ensengne* : *Bretagne*, *Meliador* 6799, *ensengne* : *acompagne*, *ibid.* 7125.

4. These syllables rime with *aine* = *ãne*. Cf. *plaine* : *ensenge*, *Rob. le Diable* 2347, *fontaine* : *plaine* (PLANEA), *ibid.* 2351, *Charlemainne* : *painne*, *Rich. li Biaus* 15, *vaingne* : *fontainne*, *ibid.* 1253, *plainnes* (PLENAS) : *compaingnes*, *ibid.* 4529, *amainne* : *Espaingne*, *ibid.* 4769, *maine* : *remaigne*, *Chev. as deus Esp.* 2293, *deschaine* : *remaigne*, *ibid.* 1461.

5. EXTRANEUS appears as *estrange* and *estragne*. Cf. *estranges* : *blanges* (verbal noun from *blangier*), *Rob. le Diable* 4383, *ensengnes* : *estranges*, *ibid.* 899, 2123, *ensegne* : *estraigne*, *ibid.* 2853, *ensengne* : *estraigne*, *Rich. li Biaus* 3887, *compaigne* : *estrange*, *Durmart* 3123, *Montaigne* : *estraigne*, *ibid.* 5353. Such rimes are incompatible with the pronunciation *ẽñe*.

While these points could not in themselves serve as final arguments for the pronunciation, yet taken together they contain a certain cumulative force, which points to the value *ãñe* for the texts in question, but the nature of the material on hand does not permit us to draw more definite conclusions.

We refrain from undertaking to determine the geographical limits of this phenomenon. The material for this investigation is here even less satisfactory than in the case of *ain* and *ein*. We may admit that it included Champagne. Chrestien de Troie rimes *aigne* : *eigne* : *iegne* : *PRENDEAM. Cp. *Bretaigne* : *ansaingne*, *Yvain* 1, *remaingne* : *praingne*, *Cliges* 2553, *ansaigne* : *apraingne*, *Yvain* 4957, *desdaing* : *praing*, *Erec* 4025. For *aigne* : *iegne* there exists only the isolated rime *plaingne* : *vaingne*, *Cliges* 3077. Usually *iegne* written *aingne* is kept distinct. Gace Brulé rimes only *aigne* : *eigne* : *PRENDEAM. Cp. *plaigne* : *ensaigne*, VIII—18, *apraigne* : *remaigne*, VIII—26, *adaigne* : *apraigne*, XVII—32.

11

However, Burgundy, as in the case of *ain* and *ein*, did
not share in this development. The *Lyon Yzopet* has *oigne*
for *eigne*, while *aigne* has remained; cp. *compaigne* : *deplaigne*
503, *aplaigne* : *acompaigne* 859, *complaignent* : *raignent*
(REGNANT) 1121, and *ensoigne* : *proigne* (*PRENDEAT) 319,
1417, *besoigne* : *ensoigne* 529, 3007, *doigne* (DIGNAT) : *ver-
goigne* 999, *ensoigne* : *cyoigne* 1165, *enproigne* : *ensoigne* 3387,
besoigne : *doigne* 3505. There is no example of fusion of
aigne : *eigne* > *oigne*. The material, collected by Görlich,
Burgund. Dial., pp. 34 and 63, shows that these examples
represent the general habit of this region. *Aigne* is written
aine, *ayne*, *eigne*, *egne*, *enne*, very rarely *oigne*, and *eigne* be-
comes usually *oigne*, though there is occasional interchange
with the former group in the orthography.

The *Estoire de La Guerre Sainte*, which on the basis of
its development of *ain* and *ein* we were inclined to place with
R. Troie and *B. Chron.*, agrees with this same group of texts
for *aigne* and *eigne*. As in the *R. Rou* the majority of rimes
in point show *aigne;* cp. 99, 347, 995, etc., in all 42 rimes.
There is one pure *eigne* rime, l. 6225, *regne* rimes with
Charlemaine 8479, and with *cheveitaigne* 8607, and we must
cite besides the isolated *empraine* (IMPREGNAT) : *enpraine*
(*IMPRENDEAT) l. 5. With this enumeration the evidence for
the pronunciation of our syllables in this text is exhausted,
and we believe it should be joined to the rimes of the Nor-
man texts in general, and interpreted together with them.

VI.

We may now endeavor to explain the difference in the
modern pronunciation of *montagne*, *châtaigne*, *enseigne* and
the like. From the preceding pages it has become evident
that not one of the long list of texts, Marot included, makes
use of the syllables *aigne* and *eigne* with their modern value.

Both rime without distinction during the whole of the Old
French period and were pronounced either *ẽṅe* or *ãṅe*, depend-
ing upon the dialect to which the text belongs. Bearing this
fact in mind, we may examine the history of *a* and *ẹ* + *ṅ*
as outlined in the Grammars.

According to Behrens [1] a parasitic *i* developed before *ṅ*
when it was final or followed by a consonant, but not when
it stood in medial position, so that we should have *compaing*,
baing, *enseint*, but *compagne*, *bagne*, *ensegne*. The *i*, which
so constantly appears also in the second group of words, is
looked upon as merely graphic. It is evident that this
explanation is intended to suit the modern form of the
words in question ; for if it is correct, *bain*, *gain*, *refrain* are
regular as well as *gagner*, *Bretagne*, *Allemagne*, *montagne*,
while *baigner*, *plaignons*, *craignons*, and the like can find a
ready explanation on the basis of analogy. However, it is
overlooked that then *araigne*, *musaraigne* and *châtaigne* are
not provided for, and that the rule does not explain the
constant union of *a* + *ṅ* and *ẹ* + *ṅ* in rime in Old French.
The further assumed difference between *a* or *ẹ* + *final ṅ* and
a' or *ẹ* + *medial ṅ* it is difficult to test, since the *i* before *ṅ* is
usually written in either position. Where it is absent before
the medial *ṅ*, it may also disappear before the same sound in
final position, as *desdang* : *faing*, *Ille et Galeron* 5407, *song* :
beson, *ibid.* 5780, though it is true that such examples are
rather rare, and ordinarily the *i* is written before final *ṅ*,
even where it is absent in the medial position.

Suchier's explanation [2] differs fundamentally from the
preceding. He maintains that in the Francian dialect *ṅ*
developed a parasitic *i* before it when it preceded the accent
as in *plaignons*, *joignons*, *Bourguignon*. The diphthong

---

[1] Schwan-Behrens, *Altfrz. Gram.*, § 203.
[2] *Altfrz. Gram.*, p. 72.

created in this way could enter the tonic syllable (*baigne*),
and this happened particularly often in the case of *ẽi*. This
new diphthong *ẽi* then shared in the common development
of *ẽi* > *ãi* toward the middle of the 12th century. As
earliest example of this development he cites *ensaignet*,
Mont. Ps. 17–37.

The evidence presented in this study precludes in my
opinion the possibility of accepting this explanation of the
problem. There is no proof that in the Norman and Anglo-
Norman dialect *ein* and *eign* developed in the direction of
ãin and *ãiń* ; on the contrary, all the evidence available
points strongly to the conclusion that *ain* and *aign* became
ẽin and *ẽiń*. If this be so, *ensaignet* in the *Mont. Ps.* can
only be the earliest evidence of the graphic confusion caused
by the coincidence of the two sounds. Furthermore one is
tempted to ask how Suchier would prove that accented *a*
and *ẹ* followed by *ń* become *ãń* and *ẽń*, while pretonic *a*
and *ẹ* + *ń* developed into *ãiń* and *ẽiń*. Certainly the ortho-
graphy of the *Mont. Ps.*, the *Camb. Ps.*, and the *Q. L. D. R.*
permits of no such conclusion, for in these texts *ń* appears as
ign or *gn* in all positions, regardless of the accent, and the
rimed texts give no evidence for the unaccented syllables.

If *eigne* toward the middle of the 12th century became
aigne, it would have to be shown in the next place when and
where the modern readjustment of the pronunciation of these
syllables was effected, and how *eigne* = *ãńe* changed back
to *ẽńe* again, while *aigne* = *ãńe* retained its Old French value.
We have seen that no evidence of such a division is visible in
the Old French texts. As far as the rimes are concerned,
both syllables are identical in all words of this group from the
end of the 12th century until Marot's time. The pronuncia-
tion of both developed in a uniform direction during the
whole of this period, and the conclusion which we have
reached is the only one justified by the evidence before us.

This value of *ēn̄e* for both *aigne* and *eigne* was slow to disappear.   Malherbe still rimes *compagne*:*dedaigne* (*Larmes de Saint-Pierre*); Tabouret[1] in 1584 states that of the words in *eigne* '*la pluspart peuvent rimer avec aigne*', and Lanoue[2] in 1595 reiterates ' *ces deux terminaisons n'ont qu'une pronontiation.*'

Yet there is evidence that the modern pronunciation was becoming established during this same period.   Meigret[3] writes *accompañé, añyao* (*agneau*), *montañes, Çharlemañe, Çhampañe, Hespañol, Montañart, Hespañe, accompañant,* only once *accompaiñé* and *pleñet* (*plaignent*) for words with Latin *a*, and *dedeñans, creñans, cr̨eñet* (*craignent*), *creñez* (*craignez*), *peñons* (*peignons*), *ẹnseñe* (*enseigne*), *enseñé* for words with Latin *e*.   Baïf[4] has *gaŋera* (*gagnera*), *montaŋe, gaŋer, konpaŋ*' (*compagne*), *akonpaŋeront* but *éŋeœs* (*agneaux*), *ẹŋelẹs* (*agnelets*) and *beiŋera* (*baignera*), *deiŋa* (*daigna*), *anseiŋement* (*enseigne*ment), *anséŋér* (*enseigner*), *anseiŋe, deiŋe* (*daigne*), and many other examples equally regular from the modern point of view.

Among the various influences which must have been potent in establishing the modern pronunciation we may mention in the first place that of the orthography.   Though *aigne* was pronounced *ēn̄e*, yet the orthography to a very large extent had retained *aigne*, though it is true, as has been shown, that *eigne* is very frequently used in its place. The written form *aigne* might cause a certain hesitation as to the proper pronunciation of the syllable.   The *i* might have been looked upon as belonging to *gn*, and just as *aille* was pronounced *al'e* so it might have been felt that *aigne* should be pronounced *an̄e*.   That this sort of reasoning actually did

[1] Thurot, *l. c.*, I, p. 330.   [2] Thurot, *ibid.*

[3] Meigret, *Le Tretté de la Grammere Françoeze*, published by Förster, Heilbronn, 1888.

[4] Jean Antoine de Baïf's *Psaultier*, published by Groth, Heilbronn, 1888.

take place seems to follow from the statement of Palliot
(1608) cited by Thurot, l. c., I, p. 330. 'Je sçay bien
qu'il y a des diphthongues quil vauldroit mieux laisser et
n'en retenir que la premiere voyelle plustost que de les
écrire ny proferer : tant il s'y donne un mauuois air par des
mal-embouchez et mauplaisants prononceurs.   Comme celle
d'*ai* en *Bretaigne, montaigne, Champaigne, aigneau :* où ils
semblent avoir le mords trops serré et se gourmer par trop,
à en faire la petite bouche, les prononçantz en *ei, eigneau,
Breteigne, monteigne, Champeigne.*'

   In the next place it is certain that during the period of
reconstruction, when the Old French changed to the modern
language, the larger portion of the words in *aigne* fell into
disuse.   Only a fraction of the Old French rime words in
aigne : eigne has passed into the modern vocabulary.   Of
those which remained a certain number readily suggested the
Latin word from which they derived, as *Allemagne, Charle-
magne, Romagne, Espagne, Pretagne.*   The Latin influence
which pervaded the language at that time could without
difficulty re-establish the original vowel in these words.

   Other words with similar ending were introduced at that
time from the Italian or the Spanish, as *campagne* < Italian
campagna, pagne < *Spanish paño.*   Both words are inter-
esting for their form.   The former occurs first in Marot, cp.
Dict. Gén. s. v., the first instance of the latter is found in the
correspondence of the Père Nacquard in 1650, cp. *ibid.* s. v.
In both cases the influence of the traditional orthography is
so strong that they are written *campaigne* and *paigne.*

   Still other words were influenced by their Italian, Spanish,
or Provençal cognates.   So *quoquaigne*[1] becomes *cocagne*

---

[1] The word is quite rare in Old French literature.   Godefroy cites it, II,
p. 164, from *Aimery de Narbonne* (: *remaigne*) and the *Enf. Ogier* (: *engaigne*).
Two other references can be found in vol. IX, Suppl. s. v., both in rime

under the influence of Italian *cuccagna*; *champaigne* changes
to *champagne* under the influence of It. *campagna*, Sp. *cam-
paña*, Prov. *campanha*; *compaigne* is affected by It. *com-
pagna*, Sp. *compaña*, Prov. *companha* in spite of the different
gender, and Old French *gaigner* loses its *i* through association
with It. *guadagnare*, in spite of the noun *gain*; and from
these simple words the new pronunciation finds its way
readily into the derivatives, so that we have *compagnie*, *com-
pagnon*, *compagnard* and the like.   Similarly *montaigne*
becomes *montagne* under the influence of It. *montagna*, Sp.
montaña. The old orthography has here lived on in the proper
name *Montaigne*, and thereby caused the continuance of the
older pronunciation.   Note also the proper name *Cham-
paigne* in rime with *peigne*, *Cyrano de Bergerac*, I, scene 2,
cited by Nyrop, *Gram. Hist.*, I, p. 196.

As far as I know, this list exhausts the modern words [1] in
-*agne*, with the exception of the learned name *Ascagne*, (the
Eneas, l. 773, has *Ascanius*) and the geographical names
Cerdagne and *Mortagne*.

Other words withstood this influence and retained their
original and regular form.   These are in the first place the
nouns *araigne*, *musaraigne*, and *châtaigne*.   The reasons for
this isolation remain obscure.   It. *aragna* and *castagna*, Sp.
araña and *castaña* might have exercised similar influence
here as in the preceding list.   That it was at work is shown
by the rime *compagne* : *aragne* in La Fontaine, *Fables*, III, 8.

The verbs finally have retained their original pronuncia-
tion.   *Plaignons* is determined by the forms of the paradigm
without *ń*, as *plaindre*; in others the orthography has been

---

with *aigne*.   The word occurs also in *Joufroi*, cp. Langlois, *La Société fran-
çaise au XIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1904, p. 42, but the text being beyond my reach
I am not able to verify the reference.

[1] *Bagne* is a comparatively recent importation from the Italian, cp. *Dict.
Gén.* s. v.

changed under the influence of the older confusion, as in
atteindre, atteignons, or *enfreindre,* O. Fr. *enfraindre,* and
fraindre. For *saigner* and its derivatives *saignée, saignant,
saignement* no apparent reason suggests itself, but *baigner*
retains its old vowel because of *bain.*

The words with $e + \acute{n}$ on the other hand have not varied
in their pronunciation. The causes which influenced the
change of *aigne* to *añe* would have served to strengthen
the pronunciation of *eñe* for *eigne.* Hence we have *enseigne,
teigne, peigne,* and all the verbs in *-eindre,* as *astreindre,
étreindre, restreindre, teindre, feindre, peindre,* and *éteindre,*
which in certain forms of the paradigm contain the syllable
eñ. Some words in this group show *ain* or *aign* through
orthographic confusion, as *Sardaigne* (SARDINIA) *daigner*
(DIGNARE), *dedaigner,* and *contraindre-contraignons.* The
whole conjugation of *craindre* is due to analogy with the
aindre verbs, and similar influence of the *eindre* class has
determined the orthography and conjugation of *geindre,
empreindre,* and *épreindre.*

JOHN E. MATZKE.